DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 134 307 PS 009 011

TITLE	National Commission on Resources for Youth on Day Care Youth Helper Program. Final Report.
INSTITUTION	National Commission on Resources for Youth, Inc., New York, N.Y.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Child Development (DHEW), Washington, D.C.; Office of Human Development (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	22 Jan 76
GRANT	OCD-CP-92
NOTE	84p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$4.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Adolescents; Child Care Centers; Curriculum Planning; *Day Care Programs; *Demonstration Programs; *Early Childhood Education; Field Experience Programs; High School Students; Inservice Teacher Education; Instructional Materials; Junior High School Students; *Parenthood Education; Program Administration; *Program Descriptions; Program Evaluation; Secondary Education; Teacher Aides; Teaching Techniques
IDENTIFIERS	*Day Care Youth Helper Program; DCYHP

ABSTRACT

This report describes the goals and concepts underlying the Day Care Youth Helper Program (DCYHP) and the history of demonstration projects through 1975. DCYHP was designed to provide young people of high school and junior high school age with the chance to work with preschool children through field experience in day care centers, coupled with a seminar for the planning of early childhood learning activities and the introduction of child development concepts. It was felt that the students participating in this program would gain a number of benefits essential to the growing process largely withheld from the majority of adolescents in their normal school experience. These benefits include participation in the world of work, the exercise of responsibility, exposure to the knowledge and skills required to become parents, the personal rewards of the helping relationship, and a chance to grow in self-esteem and confidence through meaningful activity. The materials developed for use in the program are discussed and their texts included in appendices. Finally, the report includes a synopsis of evaluative material, summing up the ways in which the program met its original goals for adolescents. Chapters include information on establishing demonstration sites, the program director, materials, field experience, the seminar, and evaluation. (HS)

Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original.

ED134307

PS

FINAL REPORT

OF

NATIONAL COMMISSION ON RESOURCES FOR YOUTH

ON

DAY CARE YOUTH HELPER PROGRAM

PS 009011

To: Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
Office of Human Development
OCD Grant: OCD-CB-92
Project Period: 7/1/71 - 12/31/75

January 22, 1976

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER 1--ESTABLISHING DEMONSTRATION SITES	9
CHAPTER 2--THE PROGRAM DIRECTOR	25
CHAPTER 3--MATERIALS	40
CHAPTER 4--FIELD EXPERIENCE	55
CHAPTER 5--SEMINAR	64
CHAPTER 6--EVALUATION	71

Appendices (attached to copy #1 only)

Appendix I--Guide for Program Directors
Appendix II-- A Happening in Hartsdale
Appendix III-- Discovery Activities
Appendix IV-- Child Observation Guide for Students
Appendix V--Child Observation Guide for Teachers
Appendix VI-- Interviewer's Handbook
Appendix VII-- For Starters: Some Workshop Ideas
Appendix VIII-- Precis Presentations
Appendix IX-- Cultural Patterns of Child Rearing
Appendix X-- MultiMedia Bibliography
Appendix XI--Handbook for Day Care Personnel
Appendix XII--Guide for Neighborhood Youth Corps
Appendix XIII--Evaluation Report for the Year 1972-1973
Appendix XIV--Evaluation Report for the Year 1973-1974
Appendix XV--Evaluation Report for the Year 1974-1975

DAY CARE YOUTH HELPER PROGRAM

Introduction

Beginning in 1971 the National Commission on Resources for Youth (NCRY) initiated the Day Care Youth Helper Program (DCYHP) at a number of demonstration sites across the country. This report describes the goals and concepts underlying the program and the history of the demonstration projects through 1975. The materials developed for use in the program are discussed and their texts are included in appendices. Finally, the report includes a synopsis of evaluative material, summing up the ways in which the program met its original goals for adolescents.

DCYHP is designed to provide young people of high school and junior high school age the chance to work with pre-school children through field experience in day care centers, coupled with a seminar for the planning of early childhood learning activities and the introduction of child development concepts. The students who participate in this program gain a number of key benefits which are widely recognized as essential to the growing up process and largely withheld from the majority of adolescents in their normal school experience. These include participation in the world of work, the exercise of real-life responsibility, exposure to the knowledge and skills required to become parents, the personal rewards of a helping relationship with other people, and the chance to grow in self-esteem and self-confidence through meaningful and challenging activity.

Demonstration programs were located in fourteen public high schools, one privately funded alternative school and one public junior high. The program has now been taken up by many other schools across the country.

Goals of the Program

--as an educational model

DCYHP is intended as an alternative educational model which is basically experiential. Child development and parenting skills and attitudes are taught in relation to children from birth to school age.

--goals for students

The program encourages young people to become responsible adults by

giving them real responsibility and challenge as teenagers, and for some it may help to define a future vocation.

It provides opportunity for the personal rewards which come from a helping relationship with others. In this DCYHP is very much an outgrowth of NCRY's earlier work in Youth Tutoring Youth (YTY).

The program teaches parenting skills and attitudes toward younger children.

It teaches child development.

It provides through the Neighborhood Corps, when available, an opportunity for teenagers to work in daycare.

The program is sufficiently flexible so that it can vary the emphasis on one or the other of these goals, and can be adapted to the talents of specific program directors and to the needs and resources of specific localities. Some programs, for example, may stress the academic child development possibilities of DCYHP, while others can focus on the vocational training aspects and still others can emphasize the personal and emotional growth of the students.

To paraphrase James Coleman, young people in post-industrial society are poor in experience, particularly experience of the adult world of work, although they are rich in information--purveyed in great quantity by the media. NCRY believes that this situation has serious consequences for the development of adolescents, making the transition to adulthood difficult. Since the founding of NCRY in 1967 by a group of educators, social scientists and businessmen, the Commission has promoted youth participation through the development of opportunities for youth which offer real responsibility and a chance to make real decisions in cooperation with adults. Offering as it does opportunities for responsible involvement with adults, DCYHP was a "natural" for NCRY.

Our society not only deprives young people of participation in the world of work, it deprives them of opportunities to care for younger children, and thus learn some of the skills and attitudes basic to parenting. Small family size is one reason for this; traditional home economics school programs are another. Important, too, is the elimination of the home as an economic unit which involved older and younger children in necessary work as well as play. Today family members use home as a base from which to disperse and "do their own thing," with a consequent loss of interaction among siblings.

Studies have shown that young people in other cultures and in other times have been involved at an early age in the rearing of their younger siblings. Preparation for parenthood came to them quite naturally. This preparation is much less assured in our current society.

The most important feature of the DCYHP program is the experiential component. The class or seminar provides the opportunity for interpretation of that experience. Further description of these components will

suggest the key features of the program.

During their hours in day care centers students work actively in responsible positions alongside day care teachers and aides. Their role is not limited to observing children, although they do learn to observe, nor are they relegated to housekeeping chores, unless these are shared by the adults.

In the seminar they reflect on their field experience. Under the guidance of the teacher, they relate their questions and concerns to what is known about child development. They listen to accounts of their classmates' experience and explore their own attitudes about children. They also become familiar with early childhood curriculum materials and techniques.

They spend part of their classroom time preparing their own learning activities for children. After trying these out, they discuss the ways in which their materials have or have not proved effective, how they might be altered.

The seminar helps students learn how young children develop--but this learning is based on their experience working with actual children. However, at the same time that it helps them to generalize from their experience it puts them in touch with their own feelings about themselves and their attitudes and expectations of little children. Thus the seminar helps students' self development and provides them with realistic expectations about young children, an important aspect in the preparation for parenthood.

The Educational Model

In all its work NCRY has been committed to active involvement for adolescents. It has therefore favored an experientially based educational model. Only such a model can give students the opportunity for "doing" and responsible "doing" which NCRY promotes. In addition, learning based on experience is usually more vivid and permanent than learning that begins in a text.

But mere activity unexamined, unreflected upon is not enough to qualify as learning in an academic sense. Experience in a day care center needs the reflection of the classroom seminar periods before it can become genuine learning or merits course credit.

The symbiosis between experience and reflection on that experience has been the critical feature of DCYHP. It has been the source of its success and occasionally of its problems. These successes and occasional problems will be documented in detail in the course of this report but here, while the focus is on the educational model, it should be pointed out that a course that is truly experiential, such as DCYHP, cannot rely on a tightly structured, pre-conceived curriculum. The direction the course takes must to some extent be governed by the special circumstances of the locality, by the questions of the students, and their problems at the day care centers--in a word by their experience. At the very least there should be a give-and-take between what the teacher has planned for the students to

learn and what their experience has been. The need for this kind of reciprocity and the absence of any preordained curriculum for the seminar raised special problems in the administration of the demonstration program, the training of project directors, and the preparation of materials.

Activities of NCRY Leading to the DCYHP

The concepts underlying DCYHP evolved out of the Commission's earlier work. A brief synopsis of the Commission's history and activities will make clear how this is so. Youth participation has been the keynote phrase throughout NCRY's history. At first NCRY undertook a nation-wide search for programs that were initiated by adolescents or involved them in responsible roles. By identifying and publicizing existing noteworthy youth programs, NCRY hoped to influence public opinion in favor of youth participation and inspire others to create new opportunities for young people. A major NCRY activity continues to be locating, verifying, and publicizing exemplary programs.

It became apparent, however, early in the Commission's history that although exemplary youth programs did exist, they were far too few and remained isolated. In consequence, NCRY expanded its role by launching under a U.S. Department of Labor grant the first of its "demonstration" programs, Youth Tutoring Youth (YTY). In these programs high school and junior high students tutor elementary school children in reading and other skills. YTY is based on the concept of the developmental benefits to adolescents of a helping relationship in which the teenager helps a younger child. In assuming responsibility for another, the adolescent improves his own skills as well as those of his younger "tutee." In the process he comes to see himself with greater self-esteem as someone who is needed.

YTY has been an enormously successful program; at 500 the Commission stopped counting the number of cities in which YTY was operating. Many cities had numerous programs, many operating through the Neighborhood Youth Corps.

The success of YTY across the country encouraged the Commission to launch the DCYHP in 1971 as the second of its demonstration programs. The benefits to adolescents of helping younger children is the key concept of the day care program as it is of the tutoring program. YTY had proved the reality and value of the helping relationship; in addition experience with YTY had shown repeatedly the special tenderness and concern, and the joy and spontaneity which teenagers bring to work with young children.

Proof of the continuing activity in YTY programs is the number of requests for YTY manuals created by NCRY - over 200,000 in less than seven years.

However, the role of the Commission has been very different in the development of the DCYHP than it was in YTY. When YTY programs were first initiated the Commission supplied funding but within two years it found that it was sufficient to supply only training and materials. With the day care program the Commission has had to take a more active and continuous

funding role and sometimes has had to intervene more actively in other ways to see that programs continued.

Before describing in specific terms the Commission's role in developing DCYHP several other factors which encouraged NCRY to initiate the program should be pointed out. In the early Seventies the nation was beginning to sense the importance of day care, and more and more day care centers were being established. During the Sixties Headstart had focused national attention on the importance of early childhood years to the individual's development throughout life. This awareness and the pressure to provide work opportunities for women, especially welfare mothers, led to the creation of more day care facilities. It appeared to the Commission that the time was ripe to introduce the concept of youth working in day care settings since there would be a need for more staff and hopefully teenagers could fill this role. Moreover, the Commission believed that if DCYHP could become institutionalized as part of existing school programs the programs would be more likely to endure if national mood changed and funding dried up. In its encouragement of opportunities for youth it has always been the Commission's strategy to hive innovative programs onto existing institutions, most often schools, so that they have a greater chance of permanence.

Another factor leading to the establishment of DCYHP was the possibility that this kind of work experience could be offered through the Neighborhood Youth Corps (NYC). NCRY had already shown that YTY could be adapted to the Neighborhood Youth Corps program, and some of the early Neighborhood Youth Corps summer programs had provided a day care work experience for some young people. However, there were no Youth Corps programs in child care where the work experience was linked to a classroom seminar; this became a key element in the Commission's model for the day care program.

DCYHP and its Relationship to Federal Agencies

In 1971 the Commission proposed to add a DCYHP component to work already contracted for with the Office of Education. At the same time the Commission was granted funds to develop the DCYHP model as a Neighborhood Youth Corps work site under a Department of Labor grant. The DCYHP became a natural extension of the Commission's already funded programs in "Youth Participation" and "Youth Tutoring Youth" for the Office of Education and the Department of Labor.

In addition, the Commission requested a grant from HEW's Office of Child Development for the DCYHP. The amount of money received from the Office of Child Development was not large, but the Commission wanted their participation in the project because their involvement would give creditability to the use of adolescents in day care centers and serve as a natural conduit for the dissemination and publicizing of the model to day care personnel.

Under joint funding the program united the concerns of these three federal agencies. But at the time that the Commission submitted its proposal for DCYHP to the Office of Education, no other agency had yet initiated its program in Education for Parenthood. Shortly thereafter the Office of Child

Development made substantial grants in this area. Thus it was the strength of the idea itself rather than the availability of federal funds which led NCRY to work to implement DCYHP at sites across the country.

An excerpt from the proposal submitted to all three agencies summarizes how the concerns of each were served:

> The program addresses itself to the interests of OCD by demonstrating, evaluating, and utilizing the knowledge resulting from an innovative program of national importance, in which adolescent staff serve to enrich the social and educational experience of young children, and permit senior day care staff greater options in adapting educational experiences to the unique needs of specific children.
>
> The program provides for DOL, the opportunity to demonstrate a new, responsible work experience for NYC in day care, and to utilize knowledge gained from this demonstration. Particularly important is that the program provides training for those youth from NYC who participate in the work experience. As part of their school day and for school credit, youth attend a seminar on child development and workshops in skills training which are designed specifically to provide them with the knowledge and skills required by their work assignment. Furthermore, participating youth are given the opportunity to explore career options, especially those related to their day care assignment.
>
> The interests of the OE are served by a program which trains individuals who will in turn train others to implement this model for experiential education, by promoting the "helper" principle of youth teaching youth, by encouraging teachers to assume new roles as resource personnel who "guide" pupils' learning, by fostering "informal" learning stimulated by a focus on the affective domain, by providing an opportunity for children to relate to different styles of teaching, by demonstrating and disseminating methods of improved education of low-income children, and by increasing cooperative relationships between related programs and institutions.

Background Study Preparatory to DCYHP

NCRY enlisted the help of a consultant, Harriet K. Cuffaro of the Bank Street staff, an early childhood specialist, to conduct a study of child development courses for adolescents across the country. Thirty-three high schools in nine states responded to the questionnaire which addressed the following issues: wed student population, program structure, course content,

materials, field work, evaluation, special concerns.

Without going into the detail of Cuffaro's report it can be said by way of summary:

--all thirty-three programs were part of the Home Economics departments of a high school.

--some programs were traditional courses in Child Development oriented toward preparing young women to be mothers.

--some (the newer programs) were vocationally oriented. Their purpose was to prepare students for careers as child care workers.

--although some limited field work was part of most programs, it was not an element in every program. Moreover, there were programs such as the Neighborhood Youth Corps programs already mentioned and one at the Henry Street Settlement in New York City in which junior high students worked in child care centers but without an opportunity for a classroom seminar or equivalent.

--finally, and most important from the point of view of the development of DCYHP, none of the programs, although they often included some field work, were truly experiential in their design. Curriculum was largely predetermined, and program structures and teachers were in most cases, not very responsive to student experience or concerns.

Some of Cuffaro's comments speak to this last issue and implicitly underline the innovative quality of DCYHP:

"Too many classes are still taught in high schools on a whole group basis surrounded by tightness and stifling qualities which are not conducive to free discussion and open participation."

"Finally, I wonder how many of the teachers have had any seminars, training, etc. in group process which would seem to me rather important when dealing with content in discussion that has the potential for considerable self-learning."

"In relation to the student involved in his/her own learning there would seem to be the necessity to open up further avenues through which students may have a greater voice in course structure. Not only in the variety of tasks offered, but also in raising their topics for research, discussion, etc."

"Finally, I think some consideration should be given to shifting the focus from the high school as the core to field sites, making greater use of the field work teacher who might also have a wider range in her child development knowledge. (I wonder how many field work teachers are involved in teaching any aspect of the child development courses.) Basically, I am striving for greater integration, more connectedness, a more experiential base to the learning process so that theory is alive and applicable, not abstractions divorced from life."*

---

*Cuffaco, Harriet K., Report on a Survey of Child Development Programs Conducted by the National Commission on Resources for Youth, 1971.

The survey made clear the ways in which the Commission's DCYHP was innovative:

--it insists on an experientially based educational model;

--it demands both field experience and the reflective seminar as part of the over-all program;

--its goals were not narrowly vocational nor was its emphasis the content of the traditional child development course. Either or both of these goals could be part of the DCYH program but within the wider context of encouraging young people--boys as well as girls--to develop a sense of responsibility, self-esteem, and attitudes appropriate to being a parent through a helping relationship with younger children.

DCYHP: Scheduling of Course

For the most part the DCYH program has been a one semester course. NCRY wanted high schools to make it a two semester course, but most schools were unwilling to do this.

The usual scheduling of the DCYH program is as follows: three or four two-hour (double) periods for work at day care centers and one double period for seminar or class time. The program provides far more field experience than most similar projects which usually give students just one period a week in the field.

Chapter I

Part I--Establishing Demonstration Sites

NCRY's Role as a Catalyst

NCRY functions as a catalyst for change, applying limited amounts of resources to certain "pressure points" in the American school system, hoping to encourage certain kinds of change within that system. It also works with agencies dealing with adolescents but concentrates on the school system, since all adolescents pass through that system.

The primary goal of the Commission in the DCYH program is to encourage school systems across the country to adopt an experiential learning model which integrates seminar and field experience. The Commission's strategy has been to maximize its limited resources by channeling them into training workshops, materials development and establishing visible and promising demonstration sites. Chapters II and III of this report describe how the first two activities have been carried out. In this chapter the Commission's strategies in establishing demonstration DCYH programs is reviewed.

The Commission functions as an ad hoc organization. At no time has the full-time staff exceeded eight professionals. Some of these have been assigned to the DCYHP while others are assigned to additional NCRY activities. Staff is supplemented, when needed, by NCRY consultants and "Associates," but these individuals have a flexible association with the Commission. Thus NCRY is not a permanent institutionalized agency. It is organized to adapt to the changing needs of programs with which it works, but only operates in the field of youth participation.

Taking a deliberate role as catalyst, NCRY maintains that if change is to be brought about, the need for it must be perceived locally. Change cannot be imposed onto a school system or any established institution by an outside agency. The Commission believes further that the potential for change usually does indeed exist locally, although some limited stimulation and guidance from the outside may be needed to help schools or other agencies tap that potential. In addition, from its work across the country, NCRY has seen the great differences in school systems. Thus a model that "works" in one local setting may have to be modified before it can work in a different setting. It has been NCRY's experience that local staff know their own needs far better than an outsider, although they may need help knowing what to do to meet these needs. Usually, too, they are in a better position to follow through on the work that must be done to make any program take hold in their unique setting. Thus a primary task for NCRY is one of stimulating school personnel to think differently about some of their programs and practices, and then assisting them in tapping the potential for change which resides within their own system.

This has been a challenging and sometimes frustrating role, for NCRY wields neither a carrot nor a stick. It cannot, for example, hire or fire staff who fail to live up to expectations, nor can it impose a particular curriculum or teaching practice. The small amount of seed money given to selected local schools is not in itself sufficient financial enticement for a school to establish a program such as DCYHP. The Commission must persuade

a school of the value of the program, relying on its ability to sell new ideas, and point out successful examples that exist in other locales. It must also find people--administrators and community members as well as teachers who are enthusiastic and prepared to make a commitment to the program.

Funding of DCYH Demonstrations

The Commission's role in funding demonstrations was determined by its insistence that one teacher be designated to spend full or three-fourths time in setting up the program. The teacher had to locate field sites, publicize the program to students and other teachers, plan course content, collect materials and orient the day care personnel. Once the course was in progress the teacher could serve part time in other programs but it is always requested that she spend time observing her students as they interacted with the little children and child care personnel at the child care centers. Schools were not budgeted to provide teachers with "released time" from other courses to carry out these activities. There were also "unusual" costs for transportation and materials that schools might not be able to build into their budget easily.

It was these circumstances which forced NCRY to fund some of its demonstration day care programs for a longer period than had been the case with its earlier demonstration program, YTY.

NCRY followed three funding patterns in establishing DCYHP sites.

1) In some cases the Commission funded the project totally including the teacher or project director's salary for two years. When this was the case the Commission acted only with the understanding that school systems would guarantee program continuation and funding after that time. Institutionalization or program continuation is an important feature of NCRY's strategy in all its work, as has been suggested earlier. The Commission does not provide service on an extended, continuing basis but instigates change which hopefully will receive local support and continue on its own momentum.

2) In other cases, NCRY covered the small costs such as student transportation. It did not pay the major costs, such as the project director's salary.

3) In still other programs, the Commission provided only training, including travel of trainees and materials, which it supplied to every project.

Moreover NCRY stimulated programs in "non-subsidized" sites as well--programs which received no funding through the Commission. These will be discussed in more detail later in the chapter.

Strategy and Criteria of Site Selection

Demonstration DCYHP projects were established between 1971 and December 31, 1975 in northern California, southern Texas, Arizona, northern New York State, southern New York State, central Connecticut, Virginia, West Virginia, eastern and western North Carolina.

In selecting demonstration sites NCRY considered the following criteria:

1) A day care center must be located near enough to the high school so that transportation will not be too great a problem.

2) Sites must be geographically dispersed in such a way that they are accessible as demonstration programs in a number of regions throughout the country.

3) Sites must be selected in such a way that child-rearing practices of the following groups are represented: inner-city black, Mexican American, American Indian, Appalachian; a representative range of socio-economic groups were also included.

4) Rural, suburban and urban conditions must be represented.

5) There must be some evidence of local strength, for example a strong school administration, and/or outstanding teaching staff, and/or an exemplary community child care program committed to some aspect of the Commission's philosophy as embodied in the DCYHP. This might be manifest in a) strong commitment to experiential education, b) a strong interest in parenting education, or c) a strong interest in humanistic education.

This requirement for local strength could also be met by the presence of a local agency or institution with commitment to NCRY philosophy such as a college that is willing to provide ongoing technical assistance to the developing DCYHP.

6) Local administration must agree to continue the program once NCRY funds are discontinued. They must indicate that they have thought through the means for accomplishing this. At a minimum, some local financial contribution must be provided at the outset.

7) The site must be so located as to encourage visitation. Thus location and national or regional prominence should be considered, as well as grants from other agencies and other innovative programs in the school district. NCRY tries to build on strengths that are already present. Communities operating urban-rural experimental schools projects were selected for these reasons.

The rationale for these criteria fall into four categories:

--assuring the practical operation of the program (1,5)

--demonstrating the feasibility of DCYHP as a model or concept (3,4,5)

--accessibility so that the site can be visited and DCYHP publicized in consequence (2,7)

--promise that the site would work

--promise of continuity (5,6).

It is worth noting here before further analysis that evidence of local strength (5) is a factor influencing various aspects of a program's success. The enthusiasm, ability, commitment and sensitivity of the individuals involved are irreplaceable qualities in a project of this sort.

The importance of assuring the practical operation of the program by locating it in a school near a day care center is obvious. Transportation of students is a key problem again and again; and an innovative program must not be jeopardized with practical problems. In a sense evidence of local strength is a guarantee of the practical operation of a program since considerable commitment and ability goes far in making a program such as DCYHP work.

Obviously enough, it is the goal of demonstration projects to show that the core concept is feasible but in a complex and diverse society like our own it is not sufficient to show that this is so in just one or two settings. Since there is an enormous variation among school systems across the country, NCRY deliberately selected demonstration sites that represented diverse geographical, socio-economic, and ethno-cultural characteristics. Thus it was planned that the demonstrations would be "tested" in a variety of school settings, which would include models for various ethnic and soci-economic groups. Programs were established which had the following characteristics:

--white, rural, poor

--black, community alternative school, poor

--black and white, suburban, mixed socio-economic status

--black, white, chicano, poor

--black and white, inner city, poor and middle class

--chicano, poor

--Indian, poor

--white, Appalachian, poor and middle class.

By now NCRY has seen how the DCYHP works in different settings; it can now share this experience in this area with others. Moreover, by insisting

on diversity NCRY has supported varied ethnic or socio-economic child-rearing practices rather than imposing any one such practice on local programs.

Accessibility was a criterion because NCRY not only wished to demonstrate the feasibility of the DCYHP model, but also to publicize the programs and encourage others to emulate them. A demonstration site which one can visit makes a program real and concrete--something one's neighbors are doing rather than a concept proposed by remote officials or mentioned in a journal.

Site selection was important to the Commission's strategy as a catalyst for change. NCRY deliberately chose demonstration sites that exhibited strength--sites where project personnel would be willing to struggle to make their own programs into models for others. These sites were chosen with great care for they would have to serve as models for others to adopt. NCRY worked closely with project personnel at these early sites sharing in mutual successes and failures.

Institutionalization of the demonstrations has been an important goal of NCRY's strategy. Often innovations are transient in our society unless they can be made a part of an existing institution. For better or worse by far the strongest institution, when one is considering innovation for young people, is the school. The Commission's policy of using local resources and staff, some initial local funds, and evidence of a genuine commitment to NCRY's philosophy of youth participation on the part of the school proved wise as a means of assuring continuity and eventual institutionalization.

During the first year of operation of the DCYH program the Commission learned of the importance of selecting a program director from within the local school system. The best possible teacher who is an outsider has small chance of being retained in competition with those who are established or tenured within the system. It is best that the demonstration become part of the bureaucracy from the beginning. But program continuation or institutionalization is not the only motivation for this strategy; as stated earlier, NCRY respects local perceptions as to their needs and ways of meeting them.

There were several other aspects to NCRY's strategy or criteria; the Commission wanted to establish at least one program in a junior high school; it did not want every program to fall within the jurisdiction of a home economics department and it wanted some variety in the academic background of program directors.

Part II of this chapter describes the implementation of these strategies in the initiation of the demonstration sites.

Part II--Initiation of Demonstration Programs

Locating sites which satisfied NCRY criteria for economic, geographic and cultural diversity, for promise of real strength and commitment and promise of continuation after funding was cut was a major staff activity. It began with the establishment of the first site in September 1971 and continued until the fall of 1974. Much effort went into locating and negotiating with school systems that would guarantee program continuation.

From the demonstration period September, 1971 - September, 1974 programs were initiated as follows in sites that were subsidized through this contract:

Initiation Date:	Location
September, 1971	San Antonio, Texas Hartford, Conn. Berkeley, California
September, 1972	Laurens, New York Greenburgh Central, N.Y. East Palo Alto, Calif. San Bernadino, Calif.
January, 1974	Window Rock, Arizona
September, 1974	Gate City, Virginia Dryden, Virginia Gatesville, N.C.

This chapter provides brief descriptions of program development at each of these sites.

Edgewood District, San Antonio

Geographic, socio-economic, ethno-cultural characteristics:

The school population in this project was composed entirely of Mexican-American students, mostly from extremely poor families. The program provided NCRY a centrally located site in the southwest with a Mexican-American population.

How NCRY discovered the site:

NCRY was familiar with the district through YTY programs which had operated there.

Strength and/or evidence of commitment:

The district superintendent had been a strong advocate of YTY. Furthermore he had the support of the school board, and he had hired a group of teachers who

were enthusiastic and committed to working with the particular student population of the district. A large day care center had just been built as part of the school system. Moreover, the superintendent of the district had won a commitment from the school board to continue the program after NCRY's two year commitment.

Visibility:

The Edgewood District had a U.S. Office of Education contract for its Career Opportunities Program (COP), and had received a large grant to become a demonstration site for the Office of Education's experimental and urban rural programs. It seemed that DCYHP would be highly visible operating in this district.

Program Continuation:

The deep commitment of the superintendent to youth participation and day care as well as his selection of a young, dynamic and committed teacher from the home economics department as program director seemed to guarantee continuance of the program. (This teacher had operated summer in school Neighborhood Youth Corps Youth Tutoring Youth programs.) The program operated successfully for two years at which time the superintendent and the project director both resigned from the school system. Thus, with the start of the third year when the program was to function for the first time independent of NCRY funds, the program was temporarily discontinued.

The new superintendent did not continue the program despite much urging by the Commission. He claimed that cut-backs accounted for this decision as did the absence of a program director for the course. But his desire to establish his own position and priorities in a newly inherited system appeared to be the determining factor.

During the following year NCRY staff members made two visits to the site and talked repeatedly by telephone with new school personnel and other persons in the community. As a result of this continuing pressure and encouragement from the Commission DCYHP was reinstituted with local funding for the 1974-1975 year.

It should also be mentioned that in this program students had experience with children as young as six months. One of the day care centers in which students were placed accepted handicapped children and some of these were as young as six months.

It is worth noting too that the original DCYHP program director now conducts a course similar to DCYHP in a junior college in San Antonio and in a high school where she volunteers.

Hartford, Connecticut

Geographic, socio-economic, ethno-cultural characteristics:

NCRY wanted a site on the east coast, not far from its New York office, that had a predominantly inner-city black population where NCRY staff could

make frequent visits, and receive first-hand knowledge of program operation. NCRY had worked with the superintendent of the Hartford schools in the development of a strong Neighborhood Youth Corps Youth Tutoring Youth program. The Commission had helped this superintendent secure a grant to run a model Youth Tutoring Youth program as part of the school curriculum and had produced a film about this program. NCRY knew well top administrative personnel in the district.

Strength and/or evidence of commitment:

The success of Hartford's Youth Tutoring Youth program indicated that school personnel were able to implement a program based on an experiential model.

Program Continuation:

At the end of the first year the program director moved from the district. A black teacher was appointed as program director for the school year 1972-1973. She was not tenured. The loss of high school population caused the dismissal of all non-tenured teachers in the spring of 1973. This taught the importance of hiring tenured teachers as program directors in the interest of continuity.

NCRY immediately secured from administrative personnel a reaffirmation of their commitment to continue the program although they were unable to do so until the second semester of the school year 1973-74. However, about this time, another teacher became interested in setting up a program similar to the DCYHP in another high school with a racially mixed population of students. With the encouragement of the administration she set up a DCYHP, attended NCRY workshops, and field tested some of the NCRY materials. Thus the DCYHP in Hartford has continued from its origin in 1972 to the present time.

During the first year of the program students were distributed among five day care centers. This posed considerable problems of supervision and preparation which had not been anticipated. This was corrected in following years. It became the pattern to encourage all field experience in no more than three sites and ideally in just one day care center.

Berkeley

Geographic, socio-economic, ethno-cultural characteristics:

The population of this school district was urban, mostly Black, with some Orientals.

How NCRY discovered the site:

The Commission found the site through contact with the district through Youth Tutoring Youth projects in school systems.

Strengths and/or evidence of commitment and Program Continuation:

The school district was also part of the Office of Education's Experimental Schools project which the Commission hoped would bring visibility to the DCYHP program. Moreover, there appeared to be the possibility of building in a Neighborhood Youth Corps component to the program since the site had a large number of Neighborhood Youth Corps enrolleeslots.

However, almost from the beginning the project was plagued with difficulties. The program began in the fall of 1971 with a home economics teacher as project director. The Commission hoped to make her co-director with the head of an excellent day care program operated by the school system. However, the latter wasgiven a very large assignment and could not continue as co-director.

Meanwhile it became clear that the director did not have credibility with black students and that she could not teach the seminar according to an experiential model. She was replaced with a black woman who ran the program until the end of the year. However, the school system failed to find an adequate new program director and NCRY discontinued funding at the start of the next school year (autumn, 1972).

The Commission learned at least two lessons from its experience in Berkeley:

--an experimental school district which is just initiating a number of large (and substantially funded) innovative programs is not apt to give a relatively small scale project like DCYHP attention or priority.

--the qualifications of a program director are crucial, particularly for teaching inner city black students. The first program director was a well-meaning white liberal--and that was not good enough.

--here, too, the Commission encountered serious problems with the teaching of the seminar which will be discussed in the fourth chapter of this report.

Greenburgh Central, Hartsdale, New York

Geographic, socio-economic, ethno-cultural characteristics:

The Greenburgh site was located near the NCRY office in New York City. Staff could visit the program often. NCRY had tried to find a site for these purposes in New York City itself, but this had proved impossible, especially since school personnel was changing so rapidly. Other sites in the surrounding area were considered but were rejected because they did not have a sufficiently mixed population.

The Greenburgh program provided a suburban site with an integrated population of black and white students, ranging from poor to upper class. The school had been integrated for fifteen years which meant that DCYHP would not be beset with the complications of a school in the process of integration.

How NCRY discovered the site:

NCRY knew of the Union Day Care Center located near Greenburgh, and was attracted to the area initially by the strength of the center and the interest of the center's director in using adolescents in day care work in the summer.

Strength and/or evidence of commitment:

The Union Day Care Center director was a leader in the field of early childhood education. She had a strong program that had local and foundation funding and she had used Neighborhood Youth Corps students in her program. She was enthusiastic about a high school program that would institutionalize the use of adolescents in child care. Furthermore she had convinced her board of the importance of such a program and of the need for teenagers for staff since she was enlarging the center. Moreover, the school had an excellent k-3 program in which youth helpers could also be placed. The director of the k-3 program was an outstanding early childhood educator who had herself wanted to use teenagers in her program.

Greenburgh Central itself had a strong home economics department with a child development course, which, however, was not experiential in it basis. The school was eager to add the experiential component. Although no staff teacher was available to run the program, the school agreed to employ a teacher to serve as program director and to make a permanent position available for this person in two years when NCRY funding ended.

Program Continuation:

The Greenburgh program has been affected by several problems. The guidance department of the school used the DCYH program for its "problem students" and thus it failed to attract students that reflected a broad spectrum of the school population.

The original program director was well trained as a day care teacher but had insufficient preparation and background for working with teenagers. The director the second year was an excellent teacher but was not tenured and could not be retained when cuts in school personnel were necessary as school population declined. She was replaced the third year by a tenured home economics teacher who continues to operate the program.

Just before the program was to begin the director of the Union Day Care Center who had attracted NCRY to the area resigned to help organize a series of YMCA-sponsored day care centers. Her successor pleaded that she could not take on adolescents at the center until she had become familiar with the center herself and trained the new staff who had been hired for the center. In the meantime the students were placed in the school-operated day care center and in kindergarten classes for their field work. Eventually they were placed at the Union Center, but some continued to be placed in kindergarten classes.

Since NCRY had deliberately selected Greenburgh because it represented a mixed student population, it was a disappointment when the program drew almost exclusively from those students who were having difficulty in school. To encourage students from across the entire student population to enter DCYHP, during the second year of operation the Commission asked that the program be announced to the entire student population rather than assigned by the guidance staff. Although trying to be helpful the school identified the program

with "Federal Projects" which the students identified with Youth Corp, so that once again in its second year DCYHP did not draw the mix of students NCRY had hoped for. However, despite all the problems at Greenburgh the experience of students within the course was gratifying proof of the validity of the DCYHP model. At one point when the school board was considering eliminating the program a group of students enrolled in DCYHP--among them some of the worst "problem" kids in the school--testified before the school board. The board found their testimony so moving and convincing that they voted to continue the program.

Laurens, New York

Geographic, socio-economic, ethno-cultural characteristics:

Laurens is a small K-12 school in a rural site in a farm community four hours from New York City.

How NCRY discovered the site:

NCRY first approached Neighborhood Youth Corps since it wanted to establish DCYHP in a rural locality that had already initiated a strong Neighborhood Youth Corps program. Discussions were also held with regional Neighborhood Youth Corps Directors and with the district directors of the Ford Foundation Leadership Training Program which provides a year's training to school administrators from rural areas, and with personnal from New York State Department of Education. NCRY was referred to the Neighborhood Youth Corps director in Oneonta, New York, which is a rural community in Northern Appalachia. This director had used youth helpers in her Neighborhood Youth Corps program and was strongly in favor of the proposed DCYHP. She investigated a number of school systems to find a system cooperating with Neighborhood Youth Corps and recommended Laurens as the most favorable possibility. She knew the superintendent from previous work and he in turn was enthusiastic about the program.

Strength or evidence of Committment

The recommendation of the county Neighborhood Youth Corps director and her strong endorsement of the school superintendent in Laurens were favorable indicators. Moreover, there was an established Headstart center within walking distance of the school and a special education center where handicapped children were brought from all over the county. NCRY had been anxious to have a site which would show that adolescents could work with "special education" children in ways that conventional teachers often cannot.

Program Continuation

During the winter of 1974-1975 the program was in its third year of operation under the direction of the same project director, Carter Morris, an unusual man who had traveled widely and was experienced in a number of areas. Furthermore, the school has added other community-based, experiential courses on the basis of its successful experience with DCYHP.

The success of DYCHP and the extension of its concept to other programs

was accomplished quite easily, almost matter-of-factly. Perhaps this can be attributed not only to the commitment, enthusiasm and flexibility of the project director and the superintendent but to the small scale of the town and considerable parental involvement. This helps a successful idea make a wide impact. The direct and personal quality of contacts and relationships within such a small town lets the practical things happen with so little effort.

San Bernadino, California

Geographic, socio-economic ethno-cultural characteristics:

This site was chosen in part because it was a junior high; NCRY wanted at least one junior high among its demonstration programs. Moreover, the school population was a microcosm of America with black, white, and Mexican-American students from low and middle-class families.

How NCRY discovered the site:

NCRY was led to the San Bernadino site through association with an informal consortiumof outstanding junior high teachers, one of whose members was a part of the San Bernadino school system.

Strength or evidence of commitment:

The school superintendent, several school board members and the assistant superintendent for early childhood education were all strongly in favor of the program. There were two child care centers in which students could work, one adjacent to the junior high school operated by the school system and the other was also nearby and was operated by a local junior college.

Program Continuation:

During the first year the DCYHP program was made a part of the ninth grade social studies program and a social studies teacher was used as co-director of the program. This reflected NCRY's strategy to show that DCYHP need not necessarily or exclusively be part of a home economics department.

During the winter of 1974-1975 the program was in its third year of operation under the original program director. During this third year it was supported entirely by local funds.

There were problems and modifications in the program from the start. After the first year the position of assistant superintendent for early childhood was abolished because of staff cut-backs. This assistant superintendant had been co-director of the DCYHP and her loss to the program was important since the other co-director was a social studies teacher with no background in early childhood education. In time, however -- and with help from Pacific Oaks consultants--she acquired the background she needed to run the program.

Just as the program was to begin the junior college discontinued its day care center leaving only one center for use as a field placement. This remaining

center was staffed by older, reactionary teachers who were not sympathetic to the Mexican-American students. The second year brought change in the leadership of the day care center. A well trained Mexican lady became the supervisor of the day care center. She welcomed students but has not been able to overcome the handicaps of the staff. The students both boys and girls, were creative and enthusiastic in their work with the younger children.

East Palo Alto (Nairobi Schools)

East Palo Alto is a small black ghetto surrounded by affluent white neighborhoods such as Menlo Park, Palo Alto and Stanford. The Nairobi schools, an alternative school system funded by donations, operates from pre-school through high school. They are the creation of a strong, all-black community movement. Dissatisfied with the education provided by public schools in this poor district, community members established the "East Palo Alto Day School System" in 1966 originally to supplement the old public school curriculum. In time this was expanded to provide a complete school curriculum.

How NCRY discovered the site:

Earlier NCRY contacts in the community which had led to the establishment of a strong Youth Tutoring Youth program inspired the choice of the Nairobi schools as a DCYHP site. Moreover, the schools were funded by the Rosenberg and other San Francisco foundations and had come to the attention of associates of NCRY.

Strength and/or evidence of commitment:

Previous contacts with the chairman of the Nairobi school system, a Black man who was assistant Secretary of Stanford University, made NCRY confident in his judgement that DCYHP could be successful in this site. The teaching staff consisted of community members as well as professional staff from Stanford University who volunteered to teach classes. As part of the school system, two day care centers had been established that were quite open to the idea of incorporating adolescents into their program. This was consistent with the system's commitment to provide a unified program from pre-school through high school. In a more general way the strong over-all organization of the community was evidence of strength.

Visibility:

Among all the Commission's DCYH demonstration programs the Nairobi High School had a unique visibility. It was a model for other community groups that wished to establish similar alternative schools. Its association with some of Stanford University's faculty helped to increase its visibility.

Program Continuation:

NCRY funded the program for two years, from 1972 to 1974. The program has continued in school year 1974-75 as part of the regular school program. The Commission learned from the Nairobi experience to adjust its own conception of teaching and training young children (and therefore what it might expect

adolescent participants in the program to learn) to the cultural patterns of the black community of East Palo Alto. The Commission had to give more than lip-service to cultural pluralism to accept the teaching of ABC's to toddlers.

Window Rock, Arizona

Geographic socio-economic ethno-cultural characteristics:

Window Rock is the capital of the 25,000 square mile "Navajo Nation," which occupies parts of Colorado, Arizona, New Mexico, and Utah. The school where the Commission established a demonstration site had a K-12 student population.

How NCRY discovered the site:

The Education Director of the Navajo Nation, Dillon Platero, who had been instrumental at an earlier date in setting up a YTY program at the Rough Rock Demonstration School, the first of the Bureau of Indian Affairs' schools to have an Indian director, helped NCRY present the DCYHP to representatives of various Navajo school districts. However, the lack of child care centers in any proximity to high schools narrowed the final choice to one possibility--Fort Defiance near Window Rock.

Strength and/or evidence of commitment:

The child care center was located near the high school and it was willing to accomadate the students. This Center was operated by the Dine Bialto Poverty Program which was part of a Navajo reservation program. The Director of it had formerly operated the Neighborhood Youth Corps for the Reservation and had placed teenagers in day care centers in summer.

The school department had located an Indian woman to operate the program.

Project Continuation:

The project began in January, 1974 in a junior high school and plans were under way to start a high school program in the fall of 1974. Shortly after the project began, the project director announced that she was pregnant. she was Indian, and it had been extremely difficult in the first place to locate an Indian qualified to serve as DCYHP director. (Yet NCRY had insisted on doing so; only an Indian could help students understand child development in the light of the child rearing practices of their own culture.)

In September 1974 Junior High teachers were reassigned and it was planned that the regular Home Economics teacher would take over supervision of the DCYH program. She was not an Indian. She was instituting a new type of home economics study oriented to the hometasks which the Indian students would experience. For this purpose new equipment such as an open fireplace had been built in the room. She decided she did not want to assume responsibility for the DCYH program. The Commission wished to see the program continue at the high school level and so arranged to have it transfered to the high school where the home economics teacher would carry on with the program. (She, too, was not an Indian but was enthusiastic about the program.) For a personal reason she

left the school's employ the day before school opened.

As of 1975 the program has not been reinstituted. It is the only project initiated by the Commission that has not continued.

Appalachian Sites

Geographic, socio-economic ethno-cultural characteristics:

The school population at these Appalachian sites was usually rural white, but at some there was a mixed black and white population.

How NCRY discovered the site:

The Commission wished to start DCYH programs in Appalachia but had great difficulty doing so. Such a program would represent a broad socio-economic, cultural, regional representation among demonstration projects. Furthermore the endeavor was seen as a way to help meet some of the particular problems of the region. However, the Commission had difficulty locating possible sites which would make a commitment to continuing funding after the NCRY funding ended. It was difficult, too, to find schools located close enough to day care centers to make field placement for students a possibility. At last the Commission was put in touch with Mr. Lon Z. Shuler, Director of the Early Childhood Development Program at the Dilenowisco Educational Cooperative in Norton, Virginia. This was operated under grants from the Appalachian Commission (five states). Mr. Shuler arranged for the Commission to meet with teachers and administrators in two counties in Virginia where school superintendents were willing to make this commitment to DCYHP. At the same time, negotiations with a North Carolina county also resulted in establishing another project site.

By the autumn of 1974 NCRY had established programs at Gate City High School, in Gate City, Virginia (Scott County); at Dryden High School in Dryden, Virginia (Lee County); and in Central High School, Gatesville, North Carolina. In the first two of these programs all the students were female, in the third there were boys and girls. In all three programs the students were white.

By the end of the 1974-75 year the Appalachian cluster had grown to include a DCYHP at Chapmanville High School, Chapmanville, West Virginia; a program at Shady Spring High School, Shady Spring, West Virginia, and a program at Spencer High School in Spencer, West Virginia. A new Virginia site had been added at Lee County Vocational School in Ben Hur. In North Carolina the program had been extended to Chowan High School in Edenton.

All the above sites were subsidized to some degree. NCRY also maintained contact with the following non-subsidized sites: Tyler County High School, Middlebourne, West Virginia; Sisterville High School, Sisterville, West Virginia; Preston County Vocational Center, Kingwood, West Virginia; Soddy Daisy High School, Soddy, Tennessee; Home On Campus, Surgoinsville, Tennessee; Orchard Vocational School, Oliver Springs, Tennessee; Bakersville Child Development Center, Bakersville, North Carolina; Burton High School, Norton, Virginia.

Strength and/or evidence of commitment:

In Appalachia the Commission found that vocational schools were the best

sites for DCYHP demonstration programs. These schools invariably offered home economics courses to which DCYHP could become an adjunct. Because these schools were for vocational training the scheduling included double periods which made field work in the day care centers possible. By now, too, NCRY had experience in setting up demonstration sites and knew the importance of choosing as project directors teachers who were tenured in their local system. In part for this reason and in part because of the small scale and relative stability of the communities in which these programs operate, DCYHP demonstration sites in Appalachia have tended to have a high degree of continuity and stability with fewer administrative problems and less teacher turn-over than has been true at a number of other sites, especially those in large cities.

Although the Commission had some difficulty finding schools close enough to day care centers to make field work possible, once these sites had been found there were fewer transportation problems than might have been expected because of the distances. It had long been the custom for teachers to drive students to and from school and for students not only to drive themselves but often to drive the school buses as well.

Some comparison could be made between these Appalachian projects and the DCYHP program in Laurens, New York. Both shared the stability of their rural or small town communities.

Where black students participated along with white the black students showed considerable ability in the handling of young children, often coming from large families with many younger siblings. They tended to be less interested, however, in the theoretical child development component of the course. This may be because it is "old hat" to them or perhaps it suggests that further work is needed on refinement of the seminar.

Non-subsidized Sites

During 1973 NCRY began to locate and work with existing local projects that were similar to the DCYHP model. Although these sites received no direct funding through NCRY, the Commission did offer technical assistance, training, and access to materials. Some of these sites in Appalachia have already been described; others included Cathedral High School, New York City; Herber Middle School, Malverne, Long Island; Hackensack High School, Hackensack, New Jersey; Wilbur Cross High School, New Haven, Connecticut; New Brunswick High School, New Brunswick, New Jersey; Bartram School for Human Services, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, and Eastern High School, Baltimore, Maryland.

Program directors at these sites provided "feedback" on NCRY materials, they participated in NCRY workshops, and their programs are now operating in such a manner that they serve as demonstration sites. In the future, NCRY will move increasingly to this mode of operation, involving itself with only a few of its "own" demonstration sites and working instead through autonomous local demonstrations.

Chapter 2

The Program Director: His Job, Responsibilities and Training

The Program Director: Important Qualities

The program director of a DCYHP project has a pivotal role in determining both the tone of the project and its chances for success. Having recognized this fact from the outset, NCRY has devoted a great deal of time and thought to the question: What makes a good program director? Again and again the experience of the demonstration sites has shown that it is intangible personal qualities rather than such measurable attributes as years of experience, knowledge of subject matter, or professional credentials which are the key to a program director's success.

Not that these attributes are unimportant: experience with adolescents or small children or both is of great use, as is training in group management or in the administration of special programs. But these "qualifications" usually prove to be secondary when it comes to directing a program which depends so heavily on personal relations and human feelings.

There follows a list of personal qualities that will be useful in a DCYH program director's job, but it is offered with this reservation: such a list makes it sound as if a program director must be an inhumanly ideal type. But this is not so; strength in some areas can overcome minor deficiencies in others.

Sensitivity, especially to the needs and feelings of the teenagers as they embark on an experience they may find threatening and frightening as well as challenging and rewarding.

Respect for the students' abilities; faith in their capacity to grow and extend themselves; trust in their ability to act responsibly.

Administrative abilities; the ability to work with day care personnel and school administrators, to handle details of scheduling and transportation; patience and resourcefulness in solving problems that arise.

Energy and enthusiasm, which are necessary to keep morale up and the program humming.

Knowledgeability and experience, not so much on paper, but in the eyes of the teenagers, who are much more willing to listen to someone they think speaks from authority.

Self-confidence and self-assurance; gives strength to the students.

Ability to spark inquiry and a willingness to embark on inquiry itself, to admit for instance to not having all the answers; the skills necessary to help students in the course of the seminar sessions better understand their experience at the day care centers and to help them generalize about child development and gain insight into themselves on the basis of this experience.

The Program Director's Job

The director of a DCYHP has duties at the high school or wherever the seminar component of the program takes place, and in the field, wherever students work in child care centers.

As seminar leader he is responsible for transmitting child development concepts and facts to students, but since DCYHP is experientially based this means that students' awareness of general concepts and abstractions should grow out of understanding their experience at day care centers.

In addition to developing students' knowledge of early childhood, the director must also help them become acquainted with the learning activities and materials available to the children in the centers, giving them a chance to experience them first hand in their training. Before they go to the center they should be helped to acquire their own "bag of tricks" -- activities they can do on their own with the children. In a less specific and tangible way he must encourage students to become aware of and value their own impressions of what they have seen and done at the child care centers; in doing so he will be promoting the key goals of the program -- the development of a sense of self-esteem through the helping relationship and the development of parenting skills and attitudes.

The other major area where the program director is responsible is in the day care centers themselves. Regular visits to the centers are important for a variety of reasons. First of all, the director must help the students. By observing them in their interactions with the children, or simply by witnessing the children's activities without the students, he can help his students interpret the children's behavior and improve their techniques for dealing with the children. Some program directors who are themselves experienced in working with young children even take part in the children's activity in order to model effective approaches for students.

The program director's visits are important to the child care staff as well. The child care teachers who accept students in their classes need to feel they have access to the students' supervisor. They may need advice on problems developing with the students or advice on how they can make the experience most productive for the teenagers.

Visits to the child care centers are essential, moreover, to the program director's perception of what the teenagers experience when they work there. Every day care center and every unit within one has its own special atmosphere, which must be experienced directly to be thoroughly understood. Besides, by observing students in their interactions with children, the director will have a much clearer idea of what happened than he would if relying exclusively on students' own accounts. This insight will benefit the seminar directly: the director will be better able to question students about their experience and better able to lead the discussion.

In addition to his duties as leader of the seminar at the junior or senior high school and supervisor of the field experience in the day care centers, he will have some organizational and administrative responsibilities as program

director. Such tasks as scheduling, recruiting and selecting students, establishing a working relationship with day care centers, holding orientation sessions both for students and for cooperating day care teachers, and arranging transportation for students to the centers must be carried out by the DCYHP director.

To summarize the tasks called for by the job, a project director must

--listen to what students are asking and saying, whether the message is direct or indirect, verbal or nonverbal;

--create an atmosphere in class that nurtures students' questioning, sharing and trust;

--be able to relate teen questions and concerns to issues of child care, child development and human growth;

--manage the human relations aspect of the field placement, contacting, cooperating with, learning from, perhaps even cajoling or appeasing the day care personnel;

--observe students "on the job" and use the observations to provide helpful, supportive feedback to students;

--recruiting students and orienting day care personnel, arranging scheduling;

--oversee transportation arrangements;

--teach knowledge about child development and about parenting attitudes and skills;

--teach knowledge about child care institutions and services;

--in some programs, provide students with vocational skills.

These tasks can be thought of as falling into three areas: interpersonal or human relations skills, administrative, and academic.

It is clear from the description of the DCYH program director's job and of the qualities and skills important to the success of the job that the program director's role exceeds and differs from that of a traditional classroom teacher's. It exceeds it because of the administrative and field work supervisor components of the job. It differs from the traditional teacher's role because the project director's stance in relation to students is not that of an "authority" dispensing a pre-determined body of knowledge, but of a facilitator helping students learn on the basis of their experience.

A facilitator recognizes that in a rapidly changing world learning how to learn is often more important than acquisition of facts. He also knows that many students are more likely to learn something when it grows out of, or is

perceived as relevant to, a concrete, real experience.

Training: Strategy and Goals

In setting up demonstration sites NCRY has tried to locate school systems in which there are teachers with the qualifications to make good program directors, or else it has encouraged the school system to recruit such (in one instance, the Commission has done the recruiting for the school system). But drawing on individuals with strong qualifications has not obviated the need for training. Few teachers have had administrative training and few have had formal training in group dynamics. Most important of all, the professional education of most teachers and the atmosphere of most school systems rarely encourage the kinds of enabling, facilitating, inquiry-minded attitudes which NCRY regards as essential to the program director's role. Many teachers, including those who have high professional qualifications and great enthusiasm for DCYHP, feel unsure and even threatened when confronted with the challenge of a DCYH program director's job.

In preparing teachers for the job of program director at the first three demonstration sites NCRY staff and consultants provided on-site technical assistance. After that, teachers planning to initiate programs came to workshops conducted as in-service training for on-going programs. In general NCRY has furnished in-service training in the form of workshops for teachers undertaking the job of program director. This training is conducted within a short period of time--no more than three weeks maximum spread over a period of a year. In designing its training, the Commission assumes that program directors already have skills and knowledge related to child care and development, although as stated earlier in this report, a program director may be trained in another area, such as social studies, in which case the Commission encourages him or her to study child development independently and to seek help from local resources such as the high school home economics staff, school psychologist, child care institutions and junior colleges.

Since it is assumed that the academic content of DCYH program is the responsibility of the trainees, the focus of the training is on preparation for the program director's role as facilitator and to a lesser extent as administrator or project manager. In other words, training focuses more on the human relations aspect of the program director's job than logistics.

The goal of training is

--to give participants a clear understanding of what experiential education is and why it is important;

--to help participants experience this mode of learning through their active participation in workshop exercises;

--to give participants some preliminary skills for implementing an experiential learning model;

--to acquaint participants with the process by which one initiates and manages a particular DCYH program.

In general the training workshops help participants practice the role of facilitator; doing so they get the feel of an experiential-learning situation.

More specifically workshops encourage participants

--to think through the goals and strategy for their own particular program;

--to develop problem-solving skills;

--to help them accept the idea that in an experientially-based course they don't have to be an "authority" with all the right answers;

--and last, but far from least, to improve their ability to direct inquiry and lead discussion.

The training sessions are experientially based. Participants engage in exercises and experiences which contribute directly to their own learning. For example, participants actually experience what it means to have a discussion grow out of their own questions and concerns -- exactly what their students will experience in the DCYHP seminar.

Many activities that participants engage in during the workshops are activities that they can use directly with their own students, such as the encouragement of self-awareness, the eliciting of questions about an experience, improvement of observation skills. Through the development of these skills trainees will be better able in their work as program directors to help students learn to observe the young children they work with at the day care centers and to learn about the behavior of young children in general on the basis of their experience with specific children at the centers. They will also be better able to help students to an understanding of their own reactions and interactions with children.

To generalize about training, trainees participate in an exercise -- they do something -- and then they talk about it -- they reflect on what they have done. This combination of action and reflection on action simulates the DCYH program itself in which students work at a day care center and then reflect on their work in the seminar.

NCRY feels that experientially-based training is most appropriate for future program directors for three reasons:

--it is the best way to counteract the usual formal training of teachers and to counter their fears or insecurities about teaching a program like DCYHP;

--it is the best way to learn the human relations skills and attitudes which the Commission regards as essential to the success of a DCYHP;

--perhaps most important, it is, as stated above, in significant ways a model of a DCYHP itself.

In summary -- and to be a little glib -- the over-all rationale for NCRY's training design is the old saw, "There's no teacher like experience."

Training: Consultants

In designing training sessions and conducting training workshops NCRY has employed consultants from the Humanistic Education Program at the School of Education of the University of Massachusetts, the Affective Education Program in Philadelphia and the Confluent Education Program at the University of Santa Barbara, as well as consultants with various other affiliations. The common philosophical premise in all these programs is the belief that learning should begin in self-awareness and that personal experience can be a springboard to learning about others. The implication is that even "objective," academic knowledge has a special vividness if it is related to personal experience -- if so to speak, its correlative can be found within the individual learner's experience.

The humanistic/affective educators whom NCRY has employed as training consultants advocate an experiential training model which does not rely on a text, and, even more to the point, is not based on the notion that learning is "just talk" -- either by teacher or student -- or merely a matter of memorizing talk. Training, of course, does not exclude "talk" but the core of the training consists of exercises in which everyone participates. Techniques such as gaming, magic circle, role play, brainstorming, and fantasy are the basis of the workshop design. Through these exercises participants gain a sense of the emotional environment conducive to a successful DCYH program; they become conscious of skills they will need in handling youth helpers and in managing the seminar; they learn something of what it will feel like to be a teenage participant in DCYH program; they develop their own capacities for problem-solving and planning; and they become conscious of young children -- how they feel and hence what their needs are. But to repeat, in all these exercises they learn <u>experientially</u>; their understanding is thus emotional as well as intellectual.

Where Training Workshops Have Been Held

Training workshops have been conducted as follows:

Tarrytown, New York	August, 1972
New York City	March, 1973
San Francisco	March, 1973
Pacific Oaks, California	June, 1973
New York City	December, 1973
Glade Valley, North Carolina	August, 1974
Unicoi, Tennessee	January, 1975
Minneapolis	April, 1975

Detailed reports of each workshop were included in the quarterly reports to the three funding agencies. These workshops began after the first demonstrations had been in existence for one year. They were not duplicates or repetitions of one another, but were tailored to the training needs of the program directors as the DCYH demonstration programs progressed at various sites. Tarrytown, for instance, was a fairly large conference, including as participants directors of existing programs and those to be established in the fall semester, as well as supervisors from day care centers. It attempted to address a wide range of issues and problems that had arisen during that first year and to give participants background in a variety of subjects bearing on the operation of a project: observation skills, teens as teachers of young children, the situation of the adolescent today, and the use of materials and activities using materials as the basis for a curriculum. In addition considerable time was devoted to discussion of goals for a DCYH program and to definition of the roles of participants.

The New York and San Francisco conferences in Spring 1973 focused on the problem of conducting a good seminar and aimed to help program directors learn to encourage inquiry and speculation and to guide inquiry in non-authoritarian ways.

Pacific Oaks concentrated on providing program directors with background in child development but always within the experiential context.

The New York workshop of December 1973 was devoted largely to teaching a "task analysis" technique useful in coordinating the functions of various individuals involved in a DCYH program.

The Glade Valley, North Carolina workshop was a fairly large scale conference with a broad agenda. Participants, most of them new to the DCYH program, prepared for work in the program by a simulation exercise which "walked them through" the planning of a DCYH program. Time was spent, too, on exercises which gave future program directors a sense of what adolescents' experience might be within the program and a sense of the experience of little children.

The Unicoi and Minneapolis workshops brought the DCYHP techniques of operation to a group of teachers most of whom had been operating child care vocational education programs in their schools. These workshops demonstrated the humanistic approach to teaching and introduced participants to the methods of inquiry and reflection based on experience which are essential to a good DCYH program seminar. The workshops emphasized that child development taught in this way could be harmonious with a vocational program.

Training Themes

There follows a description of the two central themes of NCRY training, that of building of trust which encourages sharing, and providing opportunity for practice in the helping relationship. Hopefully these will make clearer and more concrete the goals and procedures of NCRY's training sessions and of DCYH programs as a whole.

Building an Atmosphere of Trust; Encouraging Sharing

One of the first tasks for any DCYH training workshop is the encouragement of an atmosphere of trust. This trust building in turn, occupies a major portion of the initial meeting of the high school seminar.

Experiential learning is based on sharing and discussing of problems and questions that arise from what one has experienced. This type of sharing requires personal involvement and openness which cannot occur without trust. Trust is a high risk situation for many of us today, including adolescents, many of whom undergo peer pressure to "be cool" with one another, and who have learned through experience to be especially closed to adults--and especially those in positions of authority or power. Quite understandably, workshop participants are also hesitant at first to share any but their most intellectual or superficial reactions with the training group.

What encourages people to trust? The answer is age-old: a person trusts when he feels accepted as a "whole person"; when his or her thoughts, feelings, opinions, attitudes, interests, likes and dislikes, similarities and differences are valued; when he or she is known by others, recognized and appreciated.

To create an environment of trust in a training workshop individuals must be allowed to engage in experiences which affirm the value of their own ideas, feelings and interests.

Here are two examples of exercises used in NCRY workshops to encourage an atmosphere of trust:

a) At the opening of the North Carolina Glade Valley workshop, a Polaroid camera was used to take pictures of the various participants as they began to gather at the first session. This broke the ice--gave people something to talk about and laugh about. Participants then attached their picture to a large worksheet and jotted comments on the paper that they felt were relevant to the topics "I am," "I have," "I want from this workshop..." The worksheets were posted for everyone to read and comment on.

b) Each participant received a card on which he jotted down responses to topics such as "my favorite place," "a major turning point in my life," or "my favorite activity." Each participant then shared his responses with another participant.

Both these exercises aim to make participants feel that they are welcome and accepted in and of themselves as whole people and not merely or narrowly in their capacity as teachers.

It is the premise of the humanistic or affective training methodology that feelings welcomed in this way encourages participants to be trusting and consequently to involve themselves openly and <u>trustingly</u> in the training process.

It should be noted that the success of the exercises described above depends in large measure on the ability of the trainer

--to elicit the responses of participants to the exercises

--to generalize on the basis of their experience about the meaning and importance of trust and the ingredients of a trusting relationship;

--to make the connection between the trust which the trainer is trying to develop in the workshop and the atmosphere of trust which participants must develop with their students in their DCYH program.

Unless these connections are made the exercises will seem merely amusing "ice breakers."

Provision for Practice in the Helping Relation

Encouragement of the helping role is a key goal of DCYH programs. More concretely, the helping role is a key part of the student's role with the children in the day care centers. Moreover, it is an important aspect of the program director's role as facilitator. Understanding fully the meaning of a good helping relationship allows the program director to communicate his knowledge and skills without denigrating students and without setting himself up as a superior authority.

Practice in the helping relationship and reflection on it are particularly important when working with teenage students. An adolescent, growing away from childhood, is sometimes in a state of conflict over his own need for help. The questions, misunderstandings and problems that naturally arise in work with young children can cause him further conflict. Some situations encountered at the day care center may cause a youth worker to question his ability to give help. In training workshops program directors learn various techniques they can use with students to aid them in working through their feelings about the helping relationship with little children, and in resolving problems that have arisen as they tried to work with young children.

Relating to the Needs of the Children

As the program director must become sensitive to adolescents, so students must become sensitive to children. NCRY workshops demonstrate ways in which program directors may help adolescents begin to understand the experience of young children. Again there are a variety of ways this may be done.

As an introductory activity participants may brainstorm responses to the phrase "children are..." In one workshop the following responses were elicited by this exercise: children are--happy, curious, mischievous, mysterious, funny, sad, noisy, bothersome, little, quiet, playful...One way to take this kind of activity further is to look at the implications of some of the "polar behaviors" noted--noisy/quiet, happy/sad. Another possibility is to focus on one specific behavior such as aggressiveness that seems troublesome or unusual.

In one exercise, each participant spent a few minutes talking about his favorite child. In another, the participants were asked to remember their own childhood. The trainer spent a few minutes on some relaxation exercises and then slowly and quietly asked participants to go back gradually in time--through the years, college, adolescence, then to childhood, and remember very specific details about that early period--objects, colors, scenes, activities, people. As participants later talked about their memories, two important recollections emerged.

First was the sense of individual person-hood that existed in that four-year-old body, and the dependence on and vulnerability to adults. Second, most admired adults were usually those who were nurturing, yet firm. Above all, they were people who perceived the child as a person.

This exercise shows with special clarity the way in which humanistic/affective training can work. The participant experiences vividly--in this case the content of the experience is his memory of his own early childhood--and his vivid experience becomes the basis for conceptualization as to the needs of children. NCRY recommends that this exercise should be only by trained persons, leading as it can sometimes, to recall of traumatic memories which take skill to handle.

Acquiring Knowledge of Child Development From One's Own Experience with Children

The program director must be familiar with what occurs in day care settings in order to direct the process of reflection in the seminar. Then he must be able to relate these occurrences to issues of child development.

To help project directors who were experiencing difficulties in making this connection, a 5-day workshop was held at Pacific Oaks College and Nursery School in Pasadena, California. Staff of the College assumed major responsibility for leading the workshop. The College was selected because of its staff's well-known expertise in the field of child development, their commitment to effective day care, their respect for cultural pluralism as it applies to child rearing, and their commitment to experiential, humanistic education.

At this workshop, participants spent half the day at various child care centers in the neighborhood, and then took the role of student as they participated in a model seminar, reflecting on their field experience. The seminar leader, modeled by Pacific Oaks staff, drew on the field experience to lead them in a discussion of issues related to child development. Some of the issues that arose as a direct result of the field experience were the following, many of which program directors had already struggled with in their own seminars:

-- approaching child development from the perspective of the individual rather than a group norm

-- coping with a younger child's frustration

-- safety and setting limits

-- dealing with aggressive behavior

-- T.V. and violence in children

-- "tender topics" such as death, sexuality, reproduction, separation

At one point, questions regarding toilet training led to a highly charged discussion in which the leader helped a participant analyze for himself why a nine-month old child cannot be expected to be toilet trained. The participant, an adolescent who attended some of the seminars, had originally stated that he thought allnine-month-old children should be toilet trained. The transcript of the discussion which followed this statement gives some idea how the seminar leader can use carefully directed questions to help adolescents use their own knowledge to analyze an issue related to child development. The exchange is probably more condensed than that which would occur in the course of a high school seminar, but nevertheless it does illustrate a process of inquiry which project directors found quite helpful:

Teen: I absolutely believe that any child who knows how to walk should be toilet trained.

Leader: I would like to ask D.J. what you think a child has to do or know before he can go to the bathroom by himself? What kinds of skills? What does he have to do?

Teen: He has to be aware of when he has to go to the bathroom and he should do it then.

Leader: When you say should do, do you mean that he has to want to do it by himself?

Teen: Yes, he has to not have someone lead him to the bathroom.

Leader: Anything else?

Adult Participator: You have implied that he has to know the difference between wet and dry and to prefer the dry to the wet.

Teen: Yes.

Leader: How does he express that?

Teen: By saying so or by giving some indication, jumping up and down.

Leader: And then, what about getting there?

Teen: I think he should know where it is and how to use the toilet once he's there.

Leader: You would also like him to get there by himself. So basically you have named five things 1) he has to know the difference between wet and dry; 2) he has to prefer the dry to the wet; 3) he has to want to do it by himself, in other words, he has to have progressed beyond the point where he feels that everything has to be done to him. 4) He also has to have some concept of where you do it and how you do it. And 5) he has to be able to get there.

Those are the main things which are necessary for toilet training. When you think back to a child who is nine months old, do you think all of those things can happen for a child at nine months?

Teen: I think that children at that age are more aware of things than we usually think they are.

Leader: But how about the nine month old that can't walk?

Teen: Oh, I see....

Leader: So that maybe what's more important than saying that a child should be able to do such and such at a certain age we should say that a child should be toilet trained when he's ready. Could you go along with that?

Teen: Yes.

Leader: Those things may not happen for a child before he gets to be nine months old.

Adult Participant: I'd like to comment on something that Carole (the leader) has done. She has not implied a right or wrong, and she has not told D.J. that nine months is too young. She has let him do some problem solving. She let us work it out by asking the right questions. She has just opened the doors to let us realize the pre-requisite skills and conditions necessary for toilet training.

As the workshop progressed, there were some notable changes in participants' ability to relate experience to issues of child development. They became increasingly adept at observing individual children and phrasing their own questions about the behaviors of those children. They became better able to comment on behaviors in a non-judgmental way. They were better able to generate alternative ways to handle difficult situations involving children. They became more cognizant of their own value systems as they pertained to child-rearing practices and were more willing to acknowledge their own "right answer" as simply one of a variety of possible responses to a particular situation.

Learning How to Elicit Concerns, Responses, Feelings from Adolescents

Many program directors find their students closed and unresponsive at the beginning of the program. This is not surprising when one remembers that most young people are not accustomed to asking questions and searching for answers as part of a group process. Building an atmosphere of trust helps create an environment which encourages greater responsiveness on the part of students. But in addition, there are many exercises in the humanistic or affective educational repertoire which are designed to elicit student response. One such exercise which is usually demonstrated at workshops is a simple sentence completion exercise which focuses attention on a specific question, but allows an open-minded response:

-- Children are....

-- My favorite child does....

-- I worked with so and so this week and....

-- If a photographer had taken 100 pictures of me, the one I would have saved....

The San Francisco training workshop was designed specifically to give program directors practice in eliciting and focusing discussion on a particular behavior or event. Participants practice analyzing behavior with three questions in mind -- what?, so what?, now what? (which framework has been used successfully by the Philadelphia Affective Education Program).

1) Answering the question "what?" demands a specific non-judgmental description of a concrete event or behavior occurring in the child care center.

2) Answering the question "so what?" requires an analysis of the information provided in #1. How do you react to the situation? What do you know about other children or events that are similar to or different from this one? Do others share your reaction? What are the implications of the behavior or event? What do you think is happening?

3) Answering the question "now what?" requires making a decision to act. What will you do about a situation that happened yesterday? What would you do if it should recur?

The framework helps the project director organize the discussion, and when made explicit for students, it helps them organize their own experience.

Learning to Rely on One's Own Conceptual Skills

As discussed earlier it has been NCRY's strategy to see that demonstration projects are run entirely by local personnel and that they are adapted to local needs. As a consequence NCRY training must encourage participants to believe they can think for themselves and give them practice in doing so. In every workshop some time is set aside for small groups to do some problem-solving with issues that participants themselves have listed as concerns. NCRY trainers sit in on these groups, but only as resource personnel. It is up to the participants themselves to organize discussion and evaluate solutions.

At both the Tarrytown and Glade Valley Workshops, participants were asked to "simulate" setting up a DCYH program, starting with a statement of objectives and then working through the practical steps involved in implementing those objectives. This usually takes 4-6 hours and might seem an "inefficient" way for NCRY to impart information that it already knows. But in the long run, this procedure is more effective than a "canned" presentation of NCRY expertise, for by working through the problem participants learn to think of <u>themselves</u> as problem solvers and find they

do not always have to look to an external authority for answers. Participants were extremely resourceful in developing their own statements of program goals and objectives and in enumerating critical steps to implement DCYHP. At the end of the GladeValley workshop one participant remarked to the workshop director, "You know, I was going to ask you how to do something. That's what I usually do. But I just decided to go home and try to figure it out myself."

Furthermore, participants have demonstrated quite remarkably that they do have the capacity to solve their own problems if they take the time to be deliberate in analyzing what they are doing, and if they learn to use their peers as resources in planning strategies and working through solutions.

At one workshop, program directors,who individually had been having difficulty understanding how a "good" seminar might operate, found that as a group they were able to envision how that seminar might unfold. At first, the workshop leader recorded their ideas in a single newsheet pad, standing before the group. But at one point a participant grabbed the newsprint and spread about ten sheets out in the middle of the floor. Other participants gathered around and suggested organizing topics for the listed ideas and added more ideas of their own. This session was schedules to end at noon, but the participants asked that this weekend workshop be extended an extra half day, because they were too involved to stop according to schedule.

The experiential nature of NCRY's training strategy helps the program director develop an appreciation of his own potential just as involvement in DCYH program helps students develop a sense of their own capacities. Every training workshop can be considered effective if it does "nothing more" than make participants aware of their own ability. The same can be said of any single DCYH program.

Assessment of NCRY Training for Program Directors

The effectiveness of experiential training such as NCRY has offered depends on several factors:

-- the availability of a "field event" or experience which can be the basis for learning. For program directors this might consist of an encounter with students.

-- an exercise which can be a substitute for a "field event" or a simulation of certain aspects of one. Consider, for example, the typical experiental learning sequence in which participants play popular children's games such as duck walk, dodgeball or a memory game. Each of these games requires mastery of certain motor and cognitive skills. Participants experience the games and then talk about the developmental skills required for mastery. Then they are ready to begin talking about development skills of 3,4, and 5 year olds and the appropriateness of different games and activities requiring various levels of developmental mastery. If every workshop participant had actually played such games with young children fairly recently, they could be said to have had "field experience" in this area and discussion could derive from this experience. But if they have had no such experience (as is likely to be the case with most teachers preparing to be DCYH

program directors) then playing a few of these games helps to prepare them experientially to think about the development of young children and to think about what their teenage students will experience playing such games with young children in child care centers.

-- effective linking of either exercise or "field event" with general principles or truths. This is the most subtle aspect of experientially-based training, or for that matter of an experientially-based program such as DCYH. Unless the trainer can generalize and interpret the underlying content and principles of the experience -- whether it took place in the field or in a workshop session -- the experience will not serve as a stepping stone to learning. Its intellectual dimension will not have been realized.

Only the most experienced trainers are capable of establishing the sorts of links described above. For the most part, NCRY trainers have been able to operate at the high level required, making the connections between experience and principle, but on those occasions when they have failed to make the linkages between the workshop exercises and underlying principles clear, trainees have been critical of the training methodology, accusing it of being nothing more than "fun and games." However, it should be pointed out that although most participants come to an NCRY training session predisposed to an experiental approach they may find it more of a challenge than they reckoned -- consciously or unconsciously. They may be resistant to training which involved them in process and exploration rather than furnishing them from the outset with a set of "right answers." They may be uncomfortable, too, with the fact that they cannot prepare a set of "right answers" to bring to the training.

For the most part, however, participants have felt that NCRY training has helped prepare them for their job as program directors.

Chapter 3

Materials

The development of materials for use at DCYHP demonstration sites has been an important aspect of the Commission's work. These materials can be grouped in two broad categories:

--those written for students;

--those written for program directors, for the day care personnel and for Neighborhood Youth Corps Supervisors.

Materials for students can be subdivided into two groups, although there is some overlap of purpose:

--those supplying students with a "bag of tricks," a repertoire of activities to do with little children;

--those that helped students understand through their use in the seminar, child development and the socialization of children.

Some materials, such as A Happening in Hartsdale, which will be described subsequently, were originally intended for students but turned out to be more suitable for teachers.

NCRY's commitment to an experiential educational model governed the strategy it chose for the development of materials. The Commission wished the experience of the students at the demonstration sites to provide the basis for the materials. In the same way that it did not want program directors to impose on students a pre-determined curriculum unresponsive to their interests and experience, nor did it want to impose on the program directors a set of materials created entirely by "outsiders" with no direct, concrete reference to the sites themselves. Nor did it wish to prepare materials for wider dissemination which were not grounded in the experience of the DCYH demonstration programs. This strategy proved somewhat difficult to implement, particularly with regard to the development of materials for students. These difficulties will be discussed in the following paragraphs.

The Commission's experience with its earlier demonstration program, Youth Tutoring Youth, made this difficulty hard to foresee. Youth Tutoring Youth students had been encouraged to create their own activities and materials for tutoring younger children; they had responded creatively and the Commission had been able to cull from their creations fine materials for dissemination to tutoring programs across the country. NCRY hoped that a similar process would occur in the DCYH programs. However, it did not--or rather it did not until NCRY had "helped out" by creating some materials to get students going.

There were two reasons that DCYH students did not develop activity materials as spontaneously as those in Youth Tutoring Youth. In the first place, the age difference between the teenage students and the little children in the day care centers was much greater than that between the teenage tutors and their younger tutees. It was easier for tutors to think of what to do

with children only a few years younger than themselves than it was for youth helpers in a day care center to know what was appropriate for children under five. The modern nuclear family gives young people little experience with younger children--and it is a goal of the DCYH program to provide some of this experience as a preparation for parenthood. However, the lack of it made it hard for many DCYH students to know what to do initially with young children.

In the second place, program directors in the DCYH program, unlike the Youth Tutoring Youth program, had to lead seminars on the content of the course but built on the experience of the students. They found themselves somewhat at a loss when it came to conducting the seminar--and it was in the seminar that students had an opportunity to develop plans for activities and projects to pursue with children. Program directors found it difficult to elicit or guide discussion in such a way that in reflecting on their experience at day care centers students could be led to an understanding of child development principles. One reason for their difficulty was that when this program started in 1970, there were no experientially-based materials available for teaching adolescents about young children although there were some traditional textbooks, but most of these were either for college students or for typical home economic courses with little concentration on child development. NCRY had to create some materials to get program directors as well as students started.

It should be stated, too, that the DCYH program differed in another important respect from Youth Tutoring Youth, and that this difference affected the development of the materials concerning child development and the socialization of children for use in the seminar. Since the teaching of child development principles was a goal of the DCYH program, it had an academic or intellectual content that went beyond that of Youth Tutoring Youth. The program required a greater range of materials as a result of this content, and they could not be generated directly by students. Nevertheless, as suggested above, the Commission did not wish simply to impose materials that had no reference to the experience at the demonstration sites.

In the creation of the child development and socialization materials as well as the activity materials, consultants were used to develop materials in response to problems and issues arising out of the demonstration experience. They were tested at various sites, revised as necessary; they incorporated anecdotes, pictures and ideas from the sites into the final versions of the materials that were distributed to cooperating sites.

This procedure was followed in the preparation of the materials for staff as well, most notably in the guide for program directors which will be discussed subsequently.

For all the difficulties and sheer laboriousness of this approach to the development of materials from the experience at the sites, the Commission believes that it is the only sound way to proceed with programs such as DCYH. It also bears stressing that the Commission was breaking new ground in developing an experientially based course in child development and parenting. There were no exact models for the materials developed. Moreover, any short cuts in their creation would have left out important steps--either the careful observation and assessment of the needs and problems that had arisen at the sites or the field-testing, or the inclusion of ideas or pictures or

anecdotes from the sites. Most important, short cuts would have run the risk of creating materials that were essentially adult-centered.

This chapter will first discuss the materials prepared for it by students and then take up those prepared for program directors and day care personnel.

I. Materials for Students

Day Care Youth Helper Materials for students are as follows:

Happening in Hartsdale (booklet)

Happening in Hartsdale (slide show)

Discovery Activities

Observation Guide

Discussion Triggers (film)

Interviewer's Guide

Happening in Hartsdale (Activities Workshop)

These materials were part of the "bag of tricks" which students needed in order to work effectively in child care centers. NCRY was aware from the outset that students would need such a repertoire of activities for the young children if they were to be accepted as of any real "use" by the adult staff of the day care centers. The Commission hoped that program directors at the demonstration sites would help students develop this repertoire on their own--much as they had in the Youth Tutoring Youth program--but it soon became evident that they needed help in doing so. Selecting a "bag of tricks" posed a double problem: activities had to be appropriate for young children, but they also had to be meaningful and engaging for teenagers.

NCRY engaged the services of Walter Drew, director of Other Ways, an educational consulting firm. Using an experiential approach, Drew staged five workshops with DCYH students in the Greenburgh Central school in Hartsdale, one of the demonstration sites. During the first four workshops students experimented with various materials such as wood, yarn, string, cloth, cardboard, cornstarch. They "messed around," "got their hands dirty." This approach allowed them to follow where their imagination and the materials led them. In the process they discovered what they liked to do and make, and with the help of Walter Drew defined activities with the materials that would be appropriate for working with little children.

During the fifth workshop the students demonstrated the activities they had devised to the staff of the day care centers in which they worked. Students ran various "booths" where adults could participate in the particular activity being demonstrated at each booth. The Day Care personnel soon became involved and readily admitted that they gained experience that enriched their activities in the centers.

The construction of boats, planes, trucks, cars, puzzles, games, cardboard cities, and musical instruments were some of the activities which students enjoyed in the workshops and considered appropriate for working with young children. These activities, among others, were the basis of the booklet, A Happening in Hartsdale, which Walter Drew put together. The booklet also includes a description of how the workshops themselves proceeded.

A Happening in Hartsdale was field-tested at a number of demonstration sites. It became clear that although the activities themselves were popular, the reading level was too advanced for students at some of the sites. The Commission decided to develop from the booklet a slide show to use for students and the booklet as a training guide for teachers and as a supplementary booklet for students who were more advanced readers. At the same time, some of the activities were adapted for use in a second booklet, Discovery Activities, with an easier reading level.

A Happening in Hartsdale has been distributed widely and found very useful by program directors especially at the outset of a program to "get things going."

Happening in Hartsdale (slide show)

Happening in Hartsdale depicts the workshops led by Walter Drew described earlier which were the basis for developing activities which students could use with young children. It has been found useful by program directors especially at the outset of a program if they are having trouble "getting kids going."

Discovery Activities

This booklet was developed in order to add to the repertoire of things students could do with young children. It differed in conception and execution from A Happening in Hartsdale.

Earlier in this chapter the lack of experientially-based materials for teaching adolescents about child development was mentioned as was the difficulty program directors encountered in teaching child development principles on the basis of experience in child care centers. With Discovery Activities the Commission attempted to solve this problem--and at the same time add to the student's repertoire of activities.

In planning Discovery Activities NCRY hypothesized that there might be certain activities that students could participate in with young children that would stimulate their insight into children's behavior. For example, an activity in which an adolescent working with a child experiments with sinking and floating objects might be expected to evoke questions on children's ideas about whether objects (such as a coin and a cork) retain given characteristics (sinking, floating) from one moment to the next. NCRY sought the help of Ilse Mattick, a specialist of child development, to select about ten activities that students could do with children to enhance their understanding of child development. Ilse Mattick had extensive experience in the Piaget approach of child development, and she had worked with adolescents and trained paraprofessionals as well. She developed the following specifications for activities with young children:

1. Experimenting with floating and sinking objects
2. Sorting, grouping, classifying objects
3. Exploring the effect of color and of oil on water
4. Constructing a "house"
5. Constructing a "feeling box"
6. Making fruit salad
7. Exploring sounds
8. Use of gum drops and matchstick wood
9. Uncovering the picture
10. Making and using a scale.

NCRY developed instructions for students to follow in doing these activities with children. These instructions were in cartoon form, showing sequenced steps for each activity. The Commission then field-tested the first draft of the materials. Some interesting points emerged which led to subsequent revision of the materials.

It has revealed that the DCYH students have a wide range of interests and abilities. Some are interested in undertaking an activity as a vehicle to learning about child development. To these one might say, "I wonder if all four year olds know how to count to ten? Why don't you do something with them to figure out whether they can or not?"

Subsequently the materials were revised to show suggested objects that could be used for an activity with some accompanying hints about how to go about the activity, but the exact way to proceed was not specified.

Sometimes an activity would not turn out as intended when students got involved in it. For example, one activity involved mixing colors in water, and then mixing the colors to get, for example, green from yellow and blue. But one student, instead of proceeding this way, gave the children straws and everyone had great fun blowing bubbles, although no one learned about mixing colors! In the revised version of Discovery Activities instructions to the teacher suggest that this kind of experimentation and variation is all right.

As the materials were field-tested, it became obvious as it had with Happening in Hartsdale that the reading level was too advanced for some DCYH students. The final version of the materials attempts to accommodate both the slow reader and the more advanced student, by introducing the activity with simple instructions and pictures, and then including more sophisticated information for the student who wants to read further.

To summarize, Discovery Activities in its final version truly reflected the needs and interests of students within the DCYH program. Its activities provided an experiential introduction to principles of child development, but these were not imposed as an exclusive goal. Discovery Activities has been the most widely distributed and popular of the DCYH materials. Its success has been the proof of the experiential approach to the preparation of materials which in itself reflects the experiential model which is the basis of the whole DCYH program.

Interviewer's Guide

This booklet was developed for students in response to program directors' need for help in conducting the seminar component of the program. The Commission hoped that DCYH students might learn about community child-rearing practices on the basis of their experiences in child care centers, but it was very clear from the outset that program directors would need help in guiding them toward this learning. Marjorie Janis and Roger Landrum of the Yale Child Study Center were asked to develop materials that would fill this need. They began by visiting the demonstration sites and observing students at work in the day care centers. They noted that students experienced deep personal satisfaction from initiating activities with children and suggested that any DCYH materials should capitalize on students' pleasure in taking the initiative. They reinforced NCRY's belief that learning activities for the seminar should not be structured according to a test or even according to a strict sequence of lessons. Their recommendations were corroborated by Dr. Albert J. Solnit, Director of the Yale Child Study Center, who reviewed their work and reiterated the importance to adolescents of "doing" and "initiating," and of allowing theoretical discussion to rise out of these activities.

Specifically, Janis and Landrum proposed an Interviewer's Guide for DCYH students. Students would select one child, observe him/her in the child care center, interview his mother and his teacher, and prepare a notebook which put together their impressions and the findings from their interviews around the following topics: eating, sleeping, toilet training, good behavior, misbehavior, happy behavior, songs and stories, crying, attention, separation, the newborn child, what's most important in child rearing.

Through the use of the Interviewer's Guide, students pursue social anthropological field work in the area of child care. They learn first-hand about child rearing in their own community. The first part of the Interviewer's Guide tells the student:

"Every community has its own ways and its own wisdom for bringing up children. The black community has its own tradition of child rearing. Italians, Jews, New Englanders, and Navajos have their own traditions of child rearing. There are hundreds of ways of bringing up children in America, and thousands of ways of bringing up children in the world."

This work that students have themselves initiated and carried out furnishes the data for seminar discussion. Students are encouraged to pool what they have learned about individual children and families and as a group make a "book" about child rearing in their community.

As suggested earlier, NCRY had wished from the outset to show that the Day Care Youth Helper program was viable in communities with a wide range of ethnic backgrounds. The Commission also wished to stress within the program the value of cultural pluralism. The anthropological emphasis of the Interviewer's Guide helps the Commission realize these goals by giving adolescents an opportunity not only to find out about child care in their community but through seminar dsicussion and the group creation of a "book" (or other product: a film or tape for instance) to value it.

The first draft of the Interviewer's Guide was field tested in three sites. Suggestions were made for simplifying the language in the instructions for its use. It was revised and widely distributed. It has been a very successful element in NCRY's repertoire of materials; it has been found very useful by program directors, whose only criticism has been that a Spanish version would be useful.

Child Observation Guide For Students

NCRY hoped that students would reflect on their experience in child care centers, and in doing so, learn--among other things--about the needs and development of young children. However, the Commission soon discovered not only that program directors had difficulty eliciting and guiding discussion but that students themselves were sometimes not alert to significant aspects of the behavior of the children with whom they worked.

The Observation Guide was prepared by Susan Martin and Kirsten Dahl of the Child Study Center under the supervision of Drs. Sally Provence and Al Solnit. It was designed to help remedy this latter situation. The first part of the guide taught students how to observe; the second part was divided into "mini-units" suggesting different aspects of children's activities for observation; the third section discussed approaches to interpretation of observed behavior. Play, the development of sex-stereotyped behavior through verbal and non-verbal cues, aggressive behavior and response to aggressive behavior -- these were some of the areas in which the Guide encouraged students to observe.

The Guide was an attempt to help students develop a skill that is an essential key to the experiential learning which the Day Care Youth Helper Program promotes. However, the Guide has not been as successful as had been hoped; the relative "complexity of the guide" and the fact that most DCYHP students spend only limited amounts of time in child care centers, and often at the same time of day so that they do not see the full range of children's activity take place over the course of the day.

However, during site visits, NCRY staff observed that the students would discuss with them some of the very items which the guide had outlined for them to observe.

The program directors who reported most favorably on the use of the Observation Guide had themselves had training in observation techniques and could cull from the Guide material pertinent for the time of day when each student would be in the day care center.

The Commission also provided program directors with Observation Guides which had been developed elsewhere for use by parents and paraprofessionals. These in turn were considered too "complex" by the directors.

Discussion Triggers (film)

To assist program directors having difficulty getting discussions started in their seminars, NCRY developed audio-visual materials that could be used to start discussion about some important issues about children. For assistance in developing these materials NCRY turned to Xicom Communications Laboratory

which had been producing similar materials for training, hospital personnel, and industry and the US Navy Drug Program. These materials are based on "simulations," which are filmed. Individuals participating in the simulations take the roles that they have in real life. Thus a nurse in the simulation is a real nurse, an officer, a real officer etc.

To adapt this approach to the DCYH Program, the Commission found a day care teacher, young children, and two high school teachers, and two students to engage in the simulation. A child care center was set up for one day at Xicom facilities. Toys, paints, puzzles, tables, chairs, lunch and snacks were provided. Participants entered the child care center, and for the next several hours, everything that happened was videotaped in color. The Xicom crew had been alerted to the issues that were expected to arise, and to those NCRY hoped to be able to capture on videotape.

At the end of this taping, the two students who had been assisting the child care teacher met with two high school teachers and discussed what had happened. The teachers had been instructed (as are real DCYH program directors) to draw out the students' questions and problems, and to relate them, if possible, to principles of child development.

The tapes were then edited by NCRY and Xicom staff to select footage that seemed pertinent to NCRY objectives. Finally six topics were chosen to be the subject of short tapes which were then converted to film for classroom use.

The first three films show youth helpers recounting their experiences, describing their reactions to individual children and seeking advice from their project director on problems they had encountered. For example, Jackie a youth helper wonders what she should do about Dominick, "who was kicking all the time." In another film, Walter, the other youth helper, is somewhat uncomfortable remembering the little girl who asked him to take her to the bathroom and who had rubbed his face, asking about his few whiskers. In the third film a youth helper tries to understand why one little girl cried for most of the morning and wonders what he might have done to help her.

Films four and five contrast the individual nature of four children--two four year olds and two year olds. The four year olds are represented by a child who cries and withdraws and another who vigorously participates in each event of the morning. The little girl who whines recurrently watches most activities from the sidelines. She eventually enters in with the encouragement of the youth helper, but reverts to her crying later. In sharp contrast, the other four year old eagerly enters into routines, stories and games, volunteering questions, giving directions to a youth helper, responding positively to adult direction.

The two year olds also exhibit marked differences, between themselves and in comparison with the four year olds. One two year old doesn't talk at all, but involves himself totally in exploring concrete objects, performing tasks, observing the other children and the adults. The other two year old volunteers information about what she is going to do in painting, what goes on at her "camp," and what she plans to do when she returns to her "camp." She also directs a skip rope game without any assistance from the adult.

In the sixth film, the youth helper fits comfortably into activities initi-

ated by the teacher providing the children with information, giving verbal support, and generally helping the children perform various tasks.

The films are accompanied by discussion questions and supplementary material for the seminar leader.

These films were field tested by having them used in one program site, and reviewed by several teacher trainers in early childhood. There were revisions made and additional material added.

These filmed "simulations," difficult though they were to stage and edit, nevertheless provide a basis for talking about interaction between all the "actors" in the DCYH drama--youth helpers, program directors, day care personnel, and children. This makes them extremely useful since it is in these interactions that problems arise--and since it is through understanding these problems that students can learn a great deal about themselves as well as they can about children.

II. Materials for Program Directors

The seminar materials for students, such as the Observation Guide, the Interviewer's Guide, and the film Discussion Triggers are accompanied by material for program directors, which are included in the appendix and will not be discussed in detail in this chapter.

In addition, the Commission has prepared materials and films specifically for program directors. These are as follows:

Guide for Program Directors

Precis of Studies

Cultural Patterns of Child Rearing Handbook

Multimedia Bibliography

Child Observation Manual for Teachers

Youth Helper in Day Care - Information Film

Youth Helpers Use Their Skills - Slide Tape

Guide for Program Directors

This booklet is the result of observation and study at three NCRY demonstration sites by Bruce Dollar of NCRY staff over a two-year period. It is specifically designed to provide practical information to the person who intends to start and run her or his own program. In its experience with programs of youth participation, the Commission has found the usual type of how-to manual for starting a special program to be of limited usefulness. Either it is too general and abstract to give a real sense of how a program will work or should work, or it is so specific and prescriptive it doesn't lend itself to adaptation to local needs and conditions; often it somehow manages to be both. To avoid these common

shortcomings, Program Director's Book offers both the specifics and the generalities of DCYHP, in the hope that the final result will be a fuller and clearer picture than is normally available.

Using the same experiential approach that was employed in the creation of materials for students, Dollar begins the book with detailed accounts of one of the ongoing DCYH programs. The second part of the book addresses each of the following topics, again drawing examples and anecdotes from the experience of the three on-going programs which had been the source of visitation.

- The Role of Program Director
- Organizing the Program: Goals and Structure
- Recruiting and Selecting Youth Helpers
- Locating and Contacting Child Care Centers
- Orientation of Child Care Teachers
- Orientation of Youth Helpers
- The Teenagers at the Child Care Centers
- The Seminar
- Administrative Concerns:
  - Transportation
  - Scheduling
  - A DCYHP Room
  - Budget and Supplies

By describing the actual, concrete experience of real-life individuals, many of them in their own words, an attempt is made to remedy the lifelessness of so many program manuals. At the same time, it is organized to provide information on each phase of the program that a director must consider in setting up his or her own program.

The three programs studied were selected to provide information on DCYH programs in very different settings. They illustrate the way DCYHP can be adapted to different local circumstances and various student needs. One program studied takes place in a large urban high school, another in a small rural community. The youth helpers in one are all career-oriented high school junior and senior young women; in another they are high school men and women who range from eighth through twelfth grade and from low to high achievers. Although all three have multiple purposes, one program emphasizes child development content and skills, another started out with a vocational emphasis, and the third stresses personal and emotional growth. Perhaps most important of all, the programs are run by three very distinctive individuals, each of whom has put a rather personal stamp on her or his program. Their experiences become the basis for the advice which

the manual attempts to provide relative to the problems which must be encountered when initiating and operating a DCYH program. By no means does the manual exhaust the endless possibilities in carrying out a DCYH program. But it does at least give some idea of the wide range of the possibilities. In doing so, it should broaden a future program director's horizons in thinking of the potential of his own program.

Precis of Studies Relevant to Child Development

The Commission discovered in its early experience with DCYH demonstration sites that most program directors did not have sufficient academic background in Child Development to be able to answer some of the questions asked in the seminar where the students were trying to understand the significance of experiences they had observed in the children at the day care centers. Few of them had read the studies and research that are pertinent to the growth and development of a child.

To remedy this situation, the Commission asked Dr. Jane Raph, Professor of Early Childhood Education at Rutgers University, to prepare a precis of several studies which could be used to interpret certain key issues that arose in discussion at the seminars, such as aggressive behavior in children and the effects of early life experiences on children, etc. For each item considered, the purpose, method and results of the research are summarized and relevant principles of early child development are listed. There follows a series of questions for the program directors to ask students accompanied by descriptions of at least two "situations" derived from the article for students to analyze. The coverage is not extensive but it demonstrates for the program directors the possibility of using profound research as a teaching instrument with high school students.

The Precis has been field tested at two demonstration sites where program directors found them as particularly useful as a starter for discussion in the seminars. It was given to participants in workshops recently conducted in Minnesota and Appalachia. Reply has not been received as to their use of it.

Cultural Patterns of Childhood Handbook

The Commission was desirous of giving the program directors some assistance in initiating activities which would make students conscious of cultural patterns and biases in childhood. To produce materials on this subject, the Commission sought the assistance of Judy Hooper, a Commission Associate, who was a research consultant for the Los Angeles City Schools and had previously taken part in a Santa Barbara program for developing school curriculum to enhance understanding of cultural differences. She prepared the first draft of the Cultural Patterns in Childhood Handbook. It was edited and much of it reworked by another NCRY Associate, Dr. Estelle Fuchs, Professor of Anthropology at Hunter College. She has written extensively for educators in the field of Cultural Differences. It was planned that the Handbook would be part of the Commission's attempt to encourage cultural pluralism. For instance, in one activity, a seminar might divide into two groups, each would design their "ideal" day care center. They would be asked to consider such questions as:

1. Why would you establish it?

2. What would be the goal for the center?

3. What would you expect the children to do?

As each group presented its plans, the other would be asked to interpret it in the light of what it revealed about cultural biases.

Cultural Patterns of Childhood was tested in two locales; one where both the student and day care population was Mexican-American and another where the population was a microcosm of the United States. In neither site did the program director succeed in gaining much interest in the part of the students of these issues. However, they did report that the students' prepared book made from use of the Interviewer's Guide, when completed, reflected that the students had gained some consciousness of cultural differences. They reported also that it was a subject difficult for them as project directors to handle. The booklet has not been widely distributed.

Multi-Media Bibliography

The Multi-Media Bibliography was prepared in order to provide Program Directors with a resource in the form of films and publications to which they could refer to aid their understanding of child development.

The choice of film to be included and the annotations of each film was the work of Arthur Greenwald of the Yale Child Study Center in conference with staff of the center.

The Bibliography lists films which program directors might find useful in their seminars. They include a wide variety of subjects such as behavior problems of significance, children's play, etc. It provides a description and an assessment of each film. Information is also provided as to where the film can be rented, etc.

We found that local school systems could not provide funds for the rental of these films, so NCRY purchased those most relevant and has been distributing them upon request. They have been well received by the program directors and in many cases by day care center personnel as a form of instruction for their personnel.

The Bibliography also includes an annotated list of books, pamphlets and articles pertinent to the growth and development of the young child. It was prepared by Ilse Mattick of Wheelock College, an authority on early childhood education.

From the number of requests received for this pamphlet we feel certain that it is serving its purpose.

Child Observation Manual for Teachers

This manual, like the Child Observation Manual for Students, was developed for the Commission by Susan Martin and Kirsten Dahl of the Yale Child Study

Center under the supervision of Drs. Sally Provence and Al Solnit. It is a highly sophisticated piece of work, reflecting the rigorous thinking and high level of expertise that is characteristic of the Yale Child Study Center. These manuals do not "tell" either the students or the directors about little children, rather they provide a framework for using the technique of observation in such a way as to help them focus on looking at children in a systematic way.

When field tested at the sites, directors reported that often the language proved difficult for even them to follow. The language was simplified and the manuals were again distributed to project directors. These manuals have not proved to be a popular piece at most sites. However, those project directors who had specific training in early childhood were enthusiastic about them.

Youth Helper in Day Care Informational Film

This 16mm color film, 20 minutes in length, prepared by Bradley and Penny Wright, San Anselmo, California, is intended for school personnel and staff of youth serving agencies. It covers the main components of the DCYH program, and suggests possible adaptations to fit different communities. It was filmed at five sites where the DCYH program is in operation, with each site having a different student and day care population. It shows many possibilities for work with young children and for the seminar. We trust it will serve as a device for getting information on the program to teachers, day care workers and students, and to the "gate keepers" in the school systems and on boards of education.

Youth Helpers Use Their Skills (Slide Tape)

This slide tape is 15 minutes in length. It was prepared by Joan Clark and Nancy Herman to show some of the imaginative ways the students in the DCYH program have enhanced the program through their special skills. The slide tape shows teenage members of the DCYH program in Laurens, New York, using their skills as carpenters to improve the site where they work with preschool children, and how they teach some of the younger children to handle the basic tools. It is a training film for both students and project directors. It has also been helpful in "selling" the program to boards of education.

III. Material for Day Care Personnel - Handbook

As demonstration programs were initiated and program directors settled on the day care sites in which the students would be placed, it became their task to see that day care personnel understood the goals of the program, including the needs of the students who would be working in the centers. In some centers, the day care directors arranged for the DCYH program director and the students to meet with the day care center personnel. This proved successful in most cases. However, in some programs, neither the goals of the programs nor what to expect from the students was understood. To meet this need, NCRY developed a manual which would help the center personnel receive the students as auxilliary staff.

This handbook was written for the Commission by Maude Robinson, a retired New York City public school system teacher, who had supervised practice teachers from the Bank Street College of Education. The manual discusses in detail the orientation of youth helpers to the day care center -- how to make them feel comfortable and included as staff. Special emphasis is placed on the need to understand the interests and development of adolescents. This understanding cannot be taken for granted in day care personnel who have not necessarily had any direct involvement with adolescents. The manual considers ways in which day care personnel can serve as models for DCYH students who work with them. It calls attention to the possibility of modeling emotionally controlled behavior with children, transitions from one activity to another, and the handling of emotional outbursts in a small child. The manual continues focusing on the child's right to care and protection. The appreciation of young children is discussed, and this is followed by a discussion of the ways in which teenagers' special talents and interests can be employed in working with young children. A more concrete and specific analysis of activities for teenagers working with little children ensues. The manual ends with a series of questions which day care personnel can use to assess the progress of youth helpers working under their direction. These questions are as follows:

--- Does the student show insight into the developmental levels of the very young by his ability to plan activities and expect outcomes suitable for different age groups? Can he accept a wide range of childhood behavior as "normal?" Will this youth worker take a suggestion from a young child?

--- How does the student exhibit warmth, spontaneity and emotional perception as he helps the young develop cognitive and motor skills?

--- To what extent has the student become more alert to the safety needs of the day care child?

--- Can the student control personal feelings, postpone gratifications, when needs and interests of the young child are paramount? Has he learned to "hear" what children say as they talk? Is his attitude non-threatening, caring, touching?

--- Are the abilities to plan, initiate, create, complete and follow-up activities a part of the evidence that the youth helper appreciates the importance of his day care assignment?

--- Why do you believe that the student has learned to endure some of the frustrations inherent in working with young children?

--- What are the youth helper's reactions to praise and commendation, to direction, help suggestion and correction?

--- Has the student had difficulty finding his place in a structured organization? Is it easy for him to make use of his special skills and abilities? Can the youth helper ask questions, make suggestions, show consideration, function independently and accept all types of assignments as a part of his life at the day care center?

--- To what extent has the youth helper learned to verbalize personal problems and overcome some of them through successful work-school related experiences?

--- Are there indications of changes taking place in the student that show success in other areas such as improved strength in high school classroom performance, new attitudes toward punctuality, acceptance of responsibility for self outside of school?

--- Does the youth helper show understanding of the role of the day care center in the life of young children, parents, adult workers and community?

--- Is a sense of concern shown as the youth helper learns to respect rules, guidelines and regulations? How are the rights of adults and his teen peers respected?

These questions are quoted at length because they suggest very concretely the over-all goals of the Day Care Youth Helper program, particularly the way in which the program seeks to encourage behavior and understanding appropriate to parenting. Day care personnel are surrogate parents for their young charges; it is entirely appropriate that they should, by their example as well as by their explicit guidance, encourage the development of parenting skills and attitudes in youth helpers working under their direction.

The questions also suggest very clearly the experiental nature of the program. Day care personnel are asked to assess what youth helpers are doing and feeling about what they are doing -- in other words their experience. But the questions do not stop there; they are asked to assess how the students' experience is changing them, helping them to grow.

IV. Materials for Supervisors of N.Y.C. Enrollees Who Work in Day Care Centers

Because many N.Y.C. enrollees were placed in day care centers as their work site, the Commission developed a very simple guide for their supervisors. In the summer particularly these supervisors were often persons who had no previous experience in a role of administrator and found themselves unable to get enrollees placed in the centers.

This booklet tries to show how a program can be initiated and how to recruit youth interested in work in a day care center. It gives minimum requirements for pre-service and supervision.

CHAPTER 4

FIELD EXPERIENCE

What the Field Experience Means to Young People

In many respects the hours students have spent in day care centers have been the most successful aspect of the program. In this experimental component of the DCYH program young people have been allowed to assume adult responsibility for perhaps the first time. Often they have attended staff meetings and been treated as adult aides. They have been encouraged to try out their own activities with the children, some of these have been quite innovative and have been adapted by adult workers at the day care centers. They have developed warm relationships with children and have learned more about children through those relationships. Last, but far from least they have had the satisfaction of doing work which is considered important and good by society, and have received praise and recognition for it. In two out of the three years the DCYH evaluation studies have recorded students as having enjoyed the day care center experience more than the child development seminar. In all three evaluations the sensitive -- and hard to assess -- area of perceptions of self-change and competence with children between a fifth and a third of the youth helpers replied to evaluation questionnaires in such a way that it could be concluded that they had an improved self-image, an improved, more realistic understanding of children, and an improved sense of competency with children. The 1974-1975 evaluation found improved confidence in their own ability to rear children the strongest change for youth helpers over the course of participation in the program. It is hard to believe that these changes, particularly the sense of competency, could have been achieved in a traditional classroom child development course. Only the opportunity to <u>do</u>, to actually work with children in the child care centers, can give the sense of competence, and the increased sense of self-esteem that comes from it.

Predictably, however, field experience in child care centers has not been uniformly satisfactory at all sites. In one center, students were required to "teach" only within a prescribed, highly structured curriculum. At another center during one year, they continued to be viewed as a burden by the non-professional adult staff. At this center, students were not even permitted to help with simple custodial chores involved in feeding and toiletting young children - this despite monumental effort on the part of the program directors. However, there were many field experiences as described below.

As adolescents overcome whatever initial reserve they may have had toward children they often display an instinctive and even matter-of-fact capacity to respond to the emotional needs of the young. Here are the remarks of two students commenting on their experiences at child care centers:

Wally: Sometimes, I know we fool around with the little kids too much. Well, one boy's father died last year. All he's got now is his mother and sisters. So I try to fool around with him; I think he needs the male companionship.

Sarah: If I see a child who's misbehaving? First thing, if he doesn't want to talk to you, just let him alone. When he does want to talk, listen to him and figure out the problem by just talking. Yelling won't help; he'll just do it again.

As they work in the centers, the students help with activities that child care staff have planned, or they may conduct an activity of their choosing. They may work with one child or a group. They may work with a staff member or alone:

Homer: I walk in, say hi to everybody, then the teacher'll tell me to go work here or over there, and work with the kids who'll be painting or working on some project. A lot of times I go to the block corner 'cause that's where the racket is and try to calm it down. Then we build things and stuff. The other day I painted rocks with 'em. We went outside and they each picked up a rock. Then we brought 'em and painted them for a Christmas gift."

Lena: I usually have my own project I do -- like dancing and movement, or art projects like that tie-dying I did, or that sense thing with tasting, smelling and touching. They were all my own ideas. If I don't have something of my own ready, we might play with one of the games they have in the class. Oh, and I eat a lot in the house corner -- when I come in they like to serve me food, see (its not real food, just imaginary.) Usually, I check with the teacher before I start. I let her know what I'm going to do and she'll give me some ideas to maybe make it work better. The stuff I do with the kids - most of the time they get something out of it, and she knows that, so she lets me do anything I want.

Factors Influencing Field Experience

To understand the factors that contribute to the quality of the student's field experience one must consider the nature of day care centers, the preparation of students for working there, the day care personnel, and their relationship to the DCYH program director.

Affiliation with Day Care Centers

Most programs have not had much choice about which child care center(s) to affiliate with. In small communities there may be only one center. In other communities, the time and expense of transportation often precludes students' working at any center except those nearby. However, for most urban programs there is some latitude for choice.

Sometimes affiliation with a center does not work out for one reason or another -- staff changes, loss of enthusiasm, or scheduling problems. Programs in Hartford, San Bernardino, Hartsdale, Hackensack, New Brunswick and Philadelphia, have all suffered these kinds of problems and have survived the experience of dropping a center or being dropped by a center. And sometimes this happens at the last minute which has meant the project director had had to do a lot of hustling to find new sites for students. Sometimes, it has even meant that field placement had had to be postponed for a month or so. Thus far, however, persistent program directors have been successful in relocating field sites for their projects.

The quality of programs at day centers varies widely. At some centers staff are well-trained; at others they are not. Some staff care a great deal for children; others seem not to understand their needs nor to understand the differences of ethno-cultural background which affect the way they behave. Day care staff who do not interact well with children cannot be expected to serve as suitable role models for students. Students should be able to learn about teaching and handling children from the models they observe.

Moreover, staff trained to work with young children are not necessarily trained to work with adolescents. Nor do they necessarily have the time liking or affinity for adolescents that they (hopefully) have for young children. Yet it is very important to the success of students' field experience that day care center staff understand and value the students who work in their centers.

A further factor influencing the outcome of field experience for students is institutional. High schools tend to enjoy more prestige, as institutions, than day care centers. Yet, in the DCYH program, the experience at the day care center is equal in importance to that of the high school seminar. This equality must be reflected in the arrangements worked out between the two institutions. High school personnel including administrators must trust and value the field experience; high school schedules or other plans may have to be revised to accomodate the experimental component. Day care staff must perceive themselves as respected by high school staff. Providing day care staff with a sense that they are valued and respected can be achieved in many ways; asking them to conduct evaluations of the student program; holding meetings that involve DCYH staff of both institutions; inviting center staff to visit the high school; program directors visiting the center regularly.

The success of the relationship with the day care center is influenced in large measure by the attitude and administrative ability of the program director. Establishing a good relationship is something that has given some program directors difficulty, particularly in the early stages of program development. The program director often knows little about day care centers at the outset. Even if his or her training has included some exposure to day care settings, it is very unlikely that he will be trained to handle the human dynamics of maintaining a harmonious relationship between two institutions which are usually not formally or structurally related.

No money is provided to the day care center in return for student supervision. Thus the high school usually has no direct way to "control" what happens to students at the centers. Center staff must want students in their programs and must decide that they are willing to provide supervision. The only control the high school does have over the quality or extent of that supervision comes about as the result of the working relationship established by the program director with center staff.

A study made by the Commission of the child development programs in traditional junior or senior high schools where the day care center was located on the high school premises, showed that even there the relationship is usually very tenuous. In most such programs students pay only a few visits to the center; the population of children at the center is often changeable since mothers may merely leave their children at the center for a few hours. There is little opportunity for the relatively continuous and stable relationships with a group of young children that the DCYH program provides.* In very few programs was there a real integration between the experience in the center and the school course.

Site Visits by the Project Director

Clearly, site visits to the day care centers by the program director are absolutely essential. The visits serve a dual purpose. It makes the program director better prepared to lead the seminar discussions with students.** (This will be discussed in more detail in the next chapter). But they also provide for the exchange of information on a personal level, between center staff and the maintenance of a good working relationship. One program director describes her views on this activity as follows:

> I have contact with the teachers as often as possible. Whenever I observe a youth helper I always take time out for an informal conversation with the teacher in charge. Also if I hear about a problem between a teacher and a student, I'll stop in to talk to her about it. I could hear about it from either one, teacher or teenager. The informal contacts make it easier for a teacher to approach me if something comes up that I should know about. If that happens, the teacher might catch me in the hall or something and ask to get together. Another way I meet with them is to attend their staff meetings, as I did once when I wanted to say something to them all together. Also, I go to their meetings toward the end of each quarter, to go over with them the evaluation forms they fill out as part of the student's grade.
>
> I also keep superclose contact with the administrators - the principal of the kindergarten and the director of the nursery school. I'm constantly in touch with them, either when I'm there or by phone, many times a week. I feel that's really necessary. I'm very much aware that I'm coming into their schools as a guest, not as a staff member or as someone over them. It's just crucial that they know what I'm doing, that those lines of

* Harriet K., A Survey of Child Development Programs for Adolescents, Table II, page 10.

communication stay open all the time. It's really for the students' sake: it just couldn't be good experience for them if I'm not trusted in the centers where they work.

I can give you two examples of where this paid off. One is when we wanted to videotape Lucy doing stuff with the children for the seminar. I knew it would disrupt things at the nursery school, so I was on the phone four or five times that week, confirming the schedule, making sure the teachers were informed. Then when there were problems getting the equipment and it had to be postponed at the last minute, and later when the machine didn't operate right away, and everything else that seemed to be going wrong - well, it was potentially a very stressful situation, but there were no hard feelings. They were aware of the problems and they sympathized.

The other thing came up when one of the girls apparently took some money from a teacher's desk. If our relations at that point hadn't been good it would've been awfully hard to deal with that constructively.

In some programs it has been difficult to arrange for the program director to have time for visits, especially when there were several centers involved and/or centers were not located near the high school. If the DCYH program is scheduled to meet for a double school period each day with assignments alternating between center and school, the program director should be able to use part of this time for visits and is strongly encouraged to do so.

As suggested earlier, adults trained to work with young children are not usually trained also to work with teens. In fact an exclusive orientation to the young child may mean that these adults will view adolescent students as an enigma or even a threat. Teens are not children, but neither are they adults. They are as neither as malleable as children, nor as "dependable" as adults. They are bigger than children and more articulate than children. This may threaten an adult who is accustomed to working with young children, particularly one who is "in charge". Furthermore, students talk frankly in the seminar about what happens at the day care center. This constitutes a second possible source of threat to that staff member who is insecure and/or concerned about image in the community.

Some kind of orientation to the program and <u>to adolescents</u> is essential for day care personnel. In some of the demonstrations, this aspect of DCYH program was handled carelessly and confusion followed. In one program, for example, it was left to the day care administrator to explain the program to the center's staff. They were told simply that they would have some helpers or volunteers coming to their rooms from the high school. These day care teachers were totally unprepared when students arrived on the scene.

They had no plans for integrating adolescents into learning activities. In fact it had never occurred to them that this might even be a possibility. They were also disconcerted to find that students just like children (and most other people) sometimes require the sympathetic understanding of the adult in charge.

A good orientation sets the stage for staff training which occurs throughout the year in response to specific issues as they arise.

One of the best ways for DCYH students to learn how to act with children is to model themselves on day care staff. However, most day care personnel are not aware of their own behavior. "Bad role models" simply continue destructive behavior and good role models are not able to articulate for students how or why they are effective.

A key element in the orientation and training of day care personnel is the encouragement of self-awareness about behavior and the suggestion of behavior appropriate for students to model. NCRY in its Handbook for Care Staff emphasizes the importance of the following behavior with children:

--- Most situations require a soft,clear voice. Lowering the voice will cause a child to listen more carefully when one wants to focus attention. One voice is appropriate when the child is distressed, another when the child misbehaves.

--- Listening to each child with understanding may establish what role one plays in his life. The youngster who knows that one is listening to him or her will tend to listen in return. Having someone who really listens is often among a young child's greatest needs.

--- A child should never be told "I already told you once." The young child frequently needs to be given each set of directions several times, to be given hints before he is able to do what is expected of him.

--- The crying, angry, upset child cannot always stop to say what is wrong. If possible, one should divert his attention. It is best to make the diversion relate to his person or to a personal possession. Sometimes a personal favor might be asked. The situation coupled with knowledge of the child will dictate what is said.

--- The failure to treat all children fairly may cause some to fight back with disruptive behavior. The fair play principle must be kept in mind when settling quarrels during play. The teenage student is less likely to become disguested or angry with these petty quarrels once he learns that sharing with others is difficult for the young child.

--- Building a non-threatening relationship with any child -- especially a disturbed child -- requires skill. Learning how to deal with a temper tantrum is an example of the kind of difficult situation that demands non-threatening behavior on the part of adults. The child in the throes of a tantrum is frightened by this inability to gain control over himself. The supportive adult or adolescent knows how to stay near the child throughout so he or she will feel protected.

--- Reaction timing in the young child is slow. Directions and signals that require the young to change from one activity to another must be given more than once and with patience. Children need time to move from physical involvement to quiet activity, from fantasy to reality, from concentration to listening.

--- The young child can't stick with any one activity very long. Ten, fifteen minutes of attention for him can be an eternity. One must have several activities planned when spending an hour or more in a day care center working with children.

The importance of positive and negative models for adolescents is reflected in the following students' remarks:

Lena: I wish my kindergarten teacher'd been like her. She really takes an interest in what they have to say. If a kid comes up to her with a picture and she's busy, she'll take time out, or she'll say "As soon as I have time, I'll be over to look at your picture." And she will, she'll keep her promise; then maybe she'll put the picture up on the wall.

Her interest isn't phony, like she doesn't just say it's nice for the sake of saying something. If a kid has put something into it, she really appreciates it.

She's perfect. I mean, you have to see this lady work. She tells me to question her if she ever does anything I don't like or don't understand. I never have. She always knows what to say. Like she doesn't criticize them a lot, 'cause she knows if she did, then they'd have a bad reputation to live up to.

Cindy is aware of a negative model:

Cindy: One aide, she really made the kids afraid. She threatens them to get them to behave. That's the only way she got on. When she told the kids to sit down, I would go sit down, that's the honest-to-God truth. She was just that strict and mean -- I would go over and do whatever she told the kids to do, till one day Marcia came over and said, "What're you doing sittin'down?" I was scared, that's why. So I knew just how the kids felt because I felt that way myself.

James is aware of positive and negative aspects in a single model:

James: Yeah, she's good. Like the way she reacts to accidents is good -- she doesn't get all upset. But then when she tells someone not to do something she gets all down on her knees and all up close on 'em and says "You shouldn't have done that," and makes a big thing out of it. It makes them feel they really did something bad. Or else she just plain yells at 'em. Like Matthew didn't want to lie down on his mat. She yelled at him to get down, but he wouldn't. You could see it was gettin' on his nerves. So I went over and told him easy to lie down, so he did. But she frightens the kids. Sometimes it works; they never know whether she's going to yell and scare them. So they might even confess to something they didn't do -- I've seen that -- just so she won't yell. But that's not good. The kid could get mental problems or something like that.

Summary of Factors Contributing to Successful Field Experience

At the risk of repetition, here is a summary of factors contributing to successful field experience for students:

--- Selection of a promising day care center for field placement; if more than one center is involved, it is helpful if they are clustered geographically so that the project director can travel easily from one center to another;

--- Thorough orientation of students;

--- Thorough orientation and training of day care staff;

--- Establishment of a good working relationship between the program director and the day care personnel.

In addition, the following observations gathered from NCRY's demonstration programs may prove helpful:

--- The student/staff ratio should be kept low. With a high ratio young people tend to become merely an extra burden to staff. They may be viewed as extra "children", additional charges for the staff to look after;

--- The DCYH program works best in centers where young people are genuinely needed. One measure of need, of course, is a high children/staff ratio. In Cathedral High School in East Harlem, for instance, one student was assigned to each center where he was immediately needed and given responsibility.

However, if staff are extremely overworked, they may have little time to spend with students.

Another indication that students are needed is staff acceptance of them in an adult role. Thus, even when there is a high student/staff ratio, if students are entrusted with special projects, building a sandbox, perhaps, or making puppets, and given some independence, they can make a real contribution to the center's program.

--- It is important for staff to view students as an asset, but also to understand that they are not yet adults and need support and supervision. The program director may have to work with day care personnel to develop this attitude.

--- Day care programs with a prescribed curriculum are not likely to provide students with a chance to innovate, or an opportunity for independence. Some programs rely heavily on a curriculum of carefully developed learning sequences. In one of the NCRY demonstration projects where this was the case, students were indeed accepted as staff. This was a good experience for them, but working within a prescribed curriculum did not offer them the degree of independance that NCRY believes to be desirable.

--- An ideal arrangement is one in which students have a chance to meet privately with staff. As a good program develops, staff will naturally find ways to spend time informally with students. If possible, however, formal time for this interaction should be planned. In effect, this will make the day care staff accept some responsibility for the students' learning experience. Furthermore, it guarantees that this much needed interaction will occur. Students need this time, particularly to explore the problems or background of children who catch their attention. Including students in the planning of day care center activities is a very good way for staff and students to interact. Being included in planning sessions helps students understand what they are doing as part of a total program; staff in turn can be prepared to help students understand procedures as necessary. Furthermore, working on joint projects promotes a sense of continuity and co-operation.

The relationships of students with day care staff will be improved too, if the latter praise those aspects of a student's work which are going well, such as evidence of planning, attention to a child with special needs, willingness to try; evidence of warmth and affection with children.

CHAPTER 5

THE SEMINAR

The Day Care Youth Helper Program is based on an experiential or action-learning model, as this report has reiterated a number of times. But experience does not assume academic, intellectual, or personal meaning until it is interpreted--until, in fact, it becomes "experience" as opposed to event or raw action. Awareness, self-awareness, and reflection are the keys to the conversion of event and action into experience. The seminar component of the DCYH program was conceived as the place where what happened and what was observed at the day care centers would be sorted out, reflected upon, made sense of, converted, so to speak, into "experience." Making sense of what happened meant relating it to child development concepts, and this chapter will discuss some of the problems and successes which arose in the course of trying to do this.

But first it should be said that two other tasks had to be accomplished in seminar time: orienting the students for work in day care centers and equipping them with a "bag of tricks" or a set of activities which they could use in working with little children. These two tasks often overlapped. They will be discussed first before the reflective aspect of the seminar is analyzed.

Orienting Youth Helpers to Work at Day Care Centers

Before starting their work at child care centers, students need some orientation to a) what children are like, b) what activities and materials make up the program at the center, and c) what will the ground rules be and what will be expected of them at the center. Programs have varied in the way they have provided this, some giving an intensive two-week orientation at the beginning of the school year, others devoting anywhere from a month to a semester to training prior to field placement. Orientation is somewhat determined by requirements of the field sites; programs that emphasize the teaching of a child development curriculum as a primary goal tend to have longer periods of orientation. In general, a shorter orientation period is more desirable since it is less likely to "turn off" students, allows them to become involved with children sooner, and is less likely to cast the program director in an authoritarian role as a "dispenser" of knowledge.

"Bag of Tricks"--Learning What to Do with Children

An important part of the orientation of students and of class time through the semester is the planning and practice of activities for the students to do with children. They must become familiar with the activities and materials that make up the learning programs at the day care centers. The best way for students to become familiar is to play the games and use the materials that the children themselves use. Often adolescents, particularly from a low socio-economic background, have not had a very full experience of play during their own childhood. They may be inexperienced with the activities and materials day care centers provide, or they may need to regress and play themselves for a while before they are ready to work with little children. It is important that

sufficient time be set aside for this familiarization with materials at the outset of the program. Experience has shown that students who have not been given a chance to exhaust the novelty of playing children's games on their own often, when it comes time to do them with children at the centers, become so absorbed that they end up monopolizing the activity themselves. They also need to know how to do the activities well enough to handle any questions or complications that may come up when the children are doing them.

Gradually, however, exposure to the materials and activities will give them confidence, and under the guidance of the program director, the beginnings of an understanding of how young children learn. One program director commented on the way in which this process of familiarization took place in her program:

> I ordered a whole set of materials like what was at the centers--things like a unifix math set, Cisusena rods, lotto games, attribute blocks, a math balance, a Montessori cylinder block, puzzles, a set of wood blocks. The first thing was to let the teenagers play with them just to get used to them. Then we discussed how to use them with children Like with the lotto, after the whole class had played, we role played doing it with the children, and talked about whether you just hand them a card or make them say what's on it, for example. For the unifix kit (colored cubes for teaching math concepts), I started by demonstrating one of the basic things with them, then asked them to show me how else they could be used. Then they broke into groups to figure out what other concepts could be taught from them, and how. That was harder for some than others, but one student came up with a way of using them that I hadn't even thought of and this helped those having difficulty.

There are many ways which students have prepared during the seminars to conduct activities with children. The first, as mentioned, is for them to do it themselves. Then they talk about how to present it and do it with children. In the Greenburgh program, students answer these questions.

--What materials do you need?

--How many children can do it at once?

--What do the children learn from it?

--What do you tell them?

--What questions do you ask?

--What do you have them do?

--What skills do they need?

Another technique that has been used successfully in several programs is role playing: several students play children and one plays youth helper and leads the others in an activity. Afterwards, they discuss what happened and how to improve it.

After learning about standard activities to use with children, some students are ready to design an activity of their own--to think up, plan, practice and carry out their own learning activity at the center. This is where preliminary work in getting to know the needs and interests of pre-school children can be especially useful. The students should now have an idea of what children's capacities are. They should also know what kinds of things young children like to do and benefit from doing. It is hoped that they have also come to appreciate the necessity of planning and preparing in advance, and have had some experience doing so. Cooking has proved to be an activity which students particularly enjoy which they in turn can do with little children once they have practiced a "dish" like caramel apples, cookies, or popcorn balls in the seminar classroom.

The Commission stresses the importance of encouraging students to invent and execute activities of their own with children, and helping them to carry them out effectively so that a sense of competency will be encouraged.

Some program directors have further refined the introduction of students to child care activities and materials by asking their students to draw floor plans of centers and invent equipment. Others have asked students to record the actual activities of children over a period of time. This allows students to observe activities like circle games or tag, for instance.

The reader is referred to NCRY's Discovery Activities, described earlier and included in the appendix for a further, more detailed and concrete sense of the sorts of materials and activities which students learn to use with children.

The Seminar and the Teaching of Child Development Concepts

Given the experiential model on which the Day Care Youth Helper Program is based, it was planned at the outset of the program that the seminar discussions on child development should be built around the experiences of the students at child care centers--in other words, that field experience should be interpreted and reflected upon in the seminar, and that students would arrive at generalizations about the development of children from the starting point of their own individual, concrete experience with children. One program director phrased the original approach thus:

> Initially, the approach of the seminar was to work from the demands of the teenagers as they arose from their experiences at the centers. That way we'd be assured of dealing with real issues--the actual concerns of the students as they occurred to them.

It soon became apparent, however, that this approach rested on some assumptions that needed re-examination. It assumed, for instance, that the students would be able to describe their experiences adequately for discussion; that their experiences would give rise to questions, and that the students would be motivated to describe experiences and raise questions about them. The program director quoted above commented:

> First of all, I found that the "issues" the students raised almost always related to themselves but not to the children. They weren't able to distinguish what happened

> to them from what happened to the little kids. Since they would only describe what they themselves did or how they felt, it was difficult to discuss the children.
>
> Another thing I realized was that the students didn't know how to ask questions. Since they didn't know how to observe, they weren't able to tell, really, when something significant was happening around them. When I'd ask what happened at the centers, their answer would be "Nothing" or "Same as yesterday."
>
> They also had difficulty with the openness of my assignments. I was operating against their conception of what school was supposed to be like. To them, "learning" was when the teacher told you very specifically what to do and you did it just as she said.

These perceptions were true of almost every demonstration site. But they do not quite tell the whole story of the difficulties encountered in making the seminar a success. In many instances, program directors, trained in traditional educational approaches which encourage the teacher to see himself as an authority and a dispenser of knowledge, were not themselves prepared to teach an experientially-based course. They did not know how to elicit the observations and concerns of students, or recognize them. They might, for instance, read the logs or journals which all students kept of their experiences at day care centers and fail to notice or not know how to make the most of the opportunities for comment, discussion, and generalization suggested by the entries in the journals. A student might mention that "a child seemed withdrawn" and comment, "Could it be because his mother died." Too often program directors seemed to fail to recognize such themes as offering a class discussion of the impact of death and loss on little children.

The Commission has worked to improve the seminars in two ways: 1) through the development of materials (see Chapter III) and 2) through the in-service training of program directors. (see Chapter II). The multi-media materials have helped to give students tools to improve their observing skills, as well as activities from which an understanding of (mostly cognitive) child development can be derived. The materials listed in Chapter II, for program directors, in addition to the manual for program directors, have provided resources for them to draw on in order to enrich the seminar and interpret the observations of their students.

The in-service training for program directors discussed in Chapter II and summaries of the training workshops outline in great detail the NCRY training program.

From its experience with the demonstration sites the Commission has learned the following keys to a good seminar:

---The program director should make his or her own observations of students at the day care centers. These observations can serve as the basis of seminar discussion for those students who have trouble articulating their own experience. This is particularly important at the beginning of the year before the young people have had a chance to develop their own observational skills.

---If students are to talk about what they have seen and questioned. They will need help and practice in learning how to observe young children and in analyzing their behavior. Both the Interviewer's Manual and Observation Manual, discussed in Chapter II, were developed for NCRY for this purpose.

---It is helpful to have a sign up sheet in the classroom where students can write out things they would like to talk about during the seminar. It is also important to have some regular time set aside each week or in each seminar for students to talk about what they have been doing and to raise questions if they wish.

---Students need to feel they are in a supportive atmosphere before they feel comfortable exposing some of the problems they have had at the care center, or their uncertainties about how to proceed. If support and trust are absent, there will be no open discussion. Building this atmosphere requires attention and skill on the part of the program director. As explained in Chapter 2, NCRY training focuses on particularly developing this skill.

---When a student does raise a question spontaneously it may prove helpful to have resource material available which is designed to clarify the issue and to spark discussion. For example, when a teen was concerned about how young children deal with the issue of dying, the project director in one program arranged to show the Mister Rogers' film, Death of a Goldfish, which served to involve all the students with consideration of the issue. It resulted in a lively discussion and an exciting learning experience. NCRY's annotated multi media bibliography of films and books proved to be of service and useful. Also films purchased by the Commission which are loaned free of charge to programs wishing to borrow them proved of value.

---A good way to get students involved, to help them relax and to engage them in an activity that will inevitably elicit questions about little children, is to have them learn activities thay they can carry out with children at the day care center. Many of these activities outlined in NCRY's Discovery Activities or Happening in Hartsdale are helpful if the student cannot himself create activities.

---If students are not raising concerns there are ways to provide them an experience which may trigger questions or idea. The program director may, for example, involve them in an activity -- such as playing children's games, or diagramming the layout of their center -- which can then be related to questions concerning children's learning and development. Various of these activities are described in NCRY's Guide for Program Directors and NCRY's Discussion Triggers . In addition, NCRY Precis offers some suggestions (See Chapter 3).

---NCRY has found that some program directors here used techniques that are helpful in drawing students from certain "egotistical" concerns (i.e., "I hate one of the aides."), and to getting them to focus instead on issues related to little children themselves. Magic circle, for example, helps the teacher to structure questions to elicit specific kinds of information: "Children are...(and then the student completes the sentence)." NCRY training described in Chapter 2 gives progam directors exposure to and practice with some of these techniques.

---It may be that the discussion so far has given an unfairly negative picture of the seminar as it was conducted. The following report of a new NCRY staff member's visit to a seminar at a demonstration site modifies this picture.

"On Thursday, October 3rd, I visited the 45-minute afternoon seminar session. Coming in just before the class started, I greeted Joanne, the program director, and sat down among the youth helpers, introduced myself and explained a little about my work with the Commission.

A list had been written on the board of suggestions from the day care center teachers to the youth helpers and Joanne had also put up a sheet of newsprint upon which the teenagers were to list their concerns, problems, and ideas they wanted to share. One student began by describing an activity in which glazed leaves were made by a teacher at her day care center. She promised to get more details about the materials that were used for the next class. At this point, some students complained that there was not enough time to do things with the children at the center especially when they were engaged in outdoor play activities. Joanne encouraged suggestions or solutions for this problem. One idea that was offered involved taking games out in the yard with the children, however, it was recognized that this strategy would not work so well when the weather was bad. There was some discussion about a corn starch activity that a student had participated in at her center; she felt that the activity had gotten very messy and out of control. The class then got into a discussion about the effects of different kinds of classrooms, open and structured, upon the way an activity works. They observed that the former at its worst can be very disorganized while too much organization can be like a prison.

One student was very eager to talk about what to do with a particular boy in her center who talks really bad, curses, talks bad at little girls, knocks down other kids' blocks, doesn't work, and runs around like an animal. Instead of asking about what could be done with this kind of child, Joanne asked for additional examples of this kind of behavior and gradually the entire class got into an examination of motivation. For instance, one student said she had a child who was very aggressive in her class who frequently got beaten up by his father. This comment provoked a rather intense reaction in another girl who felt it was horrible that parents could be that way with their kids and get away with it. A discussion of child abuse ensued and the students discussed the role in reporting cases of abuse and neglect. One student described her own experience at being beaten by her father because she wet herself.

Joanne turned the class back to a discussion of different child behaviors and why kids behave the way they do. The class generally agreed that certain kinds of behavior can often be traced to problems at home or to an inability to deal with emotions generated about what happened in the classroom. Everyone stressed the importance of love and understanding in raising and dealing with children. Joanne asked them to describe other kinds of behavior that children exhibit which would indicate some emotional problem. One teen started to talk about a girl in one of her classes that doesn't say anything because her father is very strict with her while another student mentioned a very withdrawn child who has been passed around from family to family and does not even know her last name.

---Indeed the seminar described would not be considered optimum by everyone, but it suggests the way in which a skillful program director, sufficiently versed in child development and sufficiently deft at winning the trust and eliciting the concerns of students, can interpret their experience and generalize from it.

Chapter VI

Evaluation

The Day Care Youth Helper Program was a demonstration program and there are some experts who would question the value of even attempting a summative evaluation under these circumstances. There have been problems: the sample was exceedingly small; since there were no established instruments for evaluating projects of this sort, new instruments had to be developed and there was a need to simplify them during the second year of full scale evaluation; project personnel changed at the sites, including program directors, administrative staff and teachers; harassed teachers failed to complete questionnaires and it proved difficult to get projects who were no longer receiving funding to cooperate with the evaluation study. Nevertheless, in spite of all these handicaps, we do consider the evaluation reports for three years useful.*

The full scale evaluation for the school year 1972-73 began in November, 1972, and was conducted by Dr. Frances Heussenstamm, Associate Professor of Education at Teachers College, Columbia University. Dr. Heussenstamm also conducted the evaluation the following year, 1973-74, based on some modifications of the instruments as suggested by Dr. Ralph Tyler, Professor Emeritus, University of Chicago and personnel of the US Department of Labor. In the final year of DCYH, Dr. Heussenstamm left the University and NCRY sent out the instruments for them to be administered by the sites, Walter Furman, a graduate student at Columbia University collated and analyzed the data collected.

In addition to the above, a pilot evaluation of one site, Berkeley, during 1971-72 made by Ms. Marianne Bloch, a doctoral student under the direction of Robert D. Hess, Stanford University, involved costly procedures for intensive observation of interaction in the child development seminar that could not be adopted. That previous work, however, did give some direction to subsequent efforts.

Moreover, a study using the anthropological mode, was made at Hartsdale, New York, by Bruce Dollar, Columbia University. This became the basis of the Administrator's Manual.

In the following papers we report on the effort to evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of the projects in operation during the years 1972-74.

Site History

Note should be made of the site history of the DCYH program under this contract and of the problems of obtaining cooperation with the evaluation study from those projects no longer receiving funding. Over a four year period NCRY provided technical assistance and financial assistance to the following pilot projects:

1971-72	Berkeley, California
	Hartford, Connecticut
	San Antonio, Texas

* See Appendix

1972-73	Hartford, Connecticut San Antonio, Texas Hartsdale, New York. Laurens, New York East Palo Alto, California San Bernardino, California
1973-74	Hartford, Connecticut * San Antonio, Texas * Hartsdale, New York Laurens, New York East Palo Alto, California San Bernardino, California Window Rock, Arizona
1974-75	Hartford, Connecticut * San Antonio, Texas * Hartsdale, New York * Laurens, New York * East Palo Alto, California * San Bernardino, California * Ben Hur (Lee County) Virginia Gates City (Scott County) Virginia Gatesville, North Carolina

Technical assistance was also provided to the following locations, but no financial assistance.

1973-74	New York, New York, Malverne, New York Hackensack, New Jersey Baltimore, Maryland Norton, Virginia
1974-75	New York, New York Malverne, New York Hackensack, New Jersey Philadelphia, Pennsylvania New Brunswick, New Jersey New Haven, Connecticut San Bernadino, California Boundbrook, New Jersey Minneapolis, Minnesota Edenton, North Carolina Chapmanville, West Virginia Middlebourne, W.V. Sisterville W.V. Soddy, Tennessee Norton, Virginia

* After two years of operation, supported by local funds.

Spencer, West Virginia
Shady Springs, W.V.
Kingwood, W.V.
Rogerville, Tennessee
Oliver Springs, Tennessee
Batterville, N.C.

In 1971-72 a pilot evaluation was conducted at the Berkely site as referred to earlier. In 1972-73, Dr. Heussenstamm conducted an evaluation at all six sites in operation that year. In 1973-74 only four out of the seven cooperated with the evaluation. Two of them, Hartford and San Antonio, were no longer receiving financial assistance and Window Rock only became operational the second semester. In 1973-75 six out of nine sites cooperated. Hartford, Hartsdale and San Bernadino did so even though they were not receiving financial assistance. San Antonio, Laurens and East Palo Alto were also no longer funded and they failed to cooperate. The three new projects for that year all respo nded to the requests to administer the instruments; they, of course, were receiving funding. Statistics cited in the last two reports (1973-4 and 1974-5), therefore, do not represent the total population of the projects NCRY was assisting.

Methodology

The evaluation began with a thorough reading of the proposal, translating objectives into assumptions and hypotheses, and conferences with NCRY staff and DCYH project directors; the aim being to verify the evaluators' perceptions of (1) objectives as they were operationalized, (2) individual differences among projects, and (3) to plan for data gathering. Initial trials of new instruments were conducted.

The methodology of the study is discussed in the 1972-73 report by Heussenstamm. During that year some 55 supervising teachers completed the Early Childhood Intervention Scale. This same teacher population evaluated the performance of 83 students on the Supervising Teachers Rating Scale. All sites were visited by Dr. Heussenstamm, and structured interviews were conducted with the DCYH Project Directors, some ECEC Center Directors, who later completed the ECEC Directors Questionnaire and DCYH Project Directors reported case histories of selected participants. A total of 120 students also completed a battery of questionnaires including the Early Childhood Intervention Scale, the Who Needs Help? Questionnaire, and the two part Student Information Forms. Subsequent years essentially followed the same format, with the exception of the changes already mentioned that were made in 1973-74.

There was an emphasis on the survey technique. In the first report, 1972-73, however, a principal concern was a description of the characteristics of the student population, as opposed to offering analyses of project management, teacher performances or the effectiveness of the child development classes. With the limited time and resources available to the evaluators, the students as the target population of the DCYH program seemed the obvious group on which to concentrate. Furthermore, in assessing the demographic characteristics as well as the opinions of students, the evaluators relied heavily in the initial report on the data emerging from the completed questionnaires, with teacher's

and project director's commentary serving as secondary sources of information. The reason for reliance on questionnaire data was simply that it provided the most amount of information for the least amount of time and money. The questionnaire results for 1972-73 provided a good descriptive picture of the student population at the end of the school year.

It was not until the second year that it was possible, because of the change in the evaluation design, to discuss program effects. The second year's evaluation, 1973-74, while it reviewed, compared and contrasted the performance and development of the participating youngster, also emphasized the dissemination activities of the program directors and the staff of NCRY.

In addition to collecting data on the student population, the evaluation was designed to focus on results in four areas:

1) Vocationally-related impact on youth helpers; work habits, increased understanding of their own career interests, capabilities and interest in the field of early childhood education.

2) Comprehension by youth helpers of child development concepts - awareness of concepts, understanding of how children learn, fostering of favorable attitudes toward children.

3) Effects of the DCYH program on the participating school and day care center.

4) Dissemination activities of the program directors and the staff of NCRY.

Student Population

During the four years the DCYH program was in operation it is our estimate that the student population increased steadily. The first year of full scale evaluation, 1972-73 when all six sites participated, 120 students were involved; the following year information was supplied from four sites out of seven on 69 students, although at least 136 were involved; in 1974-75 when six sites out of nine cooperated and supplied information on 97 students, we know that at least 137 students were involved, with an additional estimate of at least another 20. All percentages therefore are calculated only on the reporting sites.

The number of boys in the program fluctuated from 30% during 1972-73 and 41.6% in 73-74 to only 8.9% in 74-75. Although obviously boys could benefit equally from the exposure to the day care experience, it takes a determined effort on the part of project staff to counteract stereo typed sex-role influences.

The age of the participants varied from year to year and from site to site, but the overall average for 1973-73, 1974-75 was 15 1/2, in 1973-74 it dropped to almost one year younger because the program was offered in earlier grades.

A racial breakdown was obtained for the first and second years only. In the first year 19.2% were White, 30.8% Black and 48.3% Spanish-surnames (this included information from the San Antonio site); in the second year 1973-74, 30.4% were White, 49.3% Black and only 18.8% Spanish-surnamed (San Antonio did not cooperate with the evaluation).

1. 1972-73 Evaluation Report

One major concern of this first evaluation was to note the characteristics of the student population. These were the salient characteristics:

1. 40% of the students came from one project, San Antonio, while the remaining 60% were evenly distributed over the other five projects.

2. 70% of the population was female.

3. About 60% of the population was between 15-17 years old. The average age of the DCYH volunteer was 15 1/2.

4. 60% of the population was composed equally of high school freshmen and juniors.

5. 79% of the population was of minority background (48% Mexican-American, 31% Black)

6. The students came from large families (75% had more than 3 siblings).

7. A majority of the population appeared to be working class.

8. 38% of the DCYH participants were students who had been behavior problems in their schools; these "special" students were in the majority at three of the projects, San Bernadino, Nairobi, and Laurens.

In addition, it was apparent that there was great variability in different sites in terms of length of time students were enrolled in the program, but that the program did seem to have an ability to retain students for more than one semester. As for students' reactions to their experiences in the program, they seemed quite satisfied with their experiences, especially the teaching in the day care centers. A high proportion of eligible students expressed a desire to re-enroll. Participation in the program did seem to help about one-third of the students express a preference for careers that were mostly child-related, although this effect did not seem to hold for black students, (being black appeared to have a mildly negative effect on the choice of this type of occupation).

In terms of changes in self-perception, students cited most frequently "increased self-understanding" and "increased insight into relationships with children." White students seemed most inclined to cite the former, students from working class families, the latter types of changes. Thirty-one percent of the students responding to the question agreed that their experience in the program had changed their relationships with supervising adults for the better. Students also appeared quite self-confident about their ability to handle teaching and conflict situations in the day care centers.

As for differences among projects, the San Bernardino students seemed to think quite highly of their project, especially the relationship of the school to the project. On the other hand, Nairobi students stood out as claiming that their experiences in the program had not changed them at all. There did seem to be a fairly high level of approval of the training and orientation procedures in all projects. In an examination of regular and "special" students, it appeared that while "special" students seemed somewhat less changed by their experiences in the program than regular students, the problem students did seem more inclined to re-enroll than regular students.

Competence of Students in Early Childhood Education

Responses by teachers and students to the Early Childhood Intervention Scale did indicate that teachers were more able to pick out the correct interventions than students, but the fact that half of the participants could get two-thirds of the correct answers certainly showed considerable competence. About ninety percent of the students who returned the Who Needs Help? Questionnaire indicated that they had developed close enough relationships with two children, to adequately describe these children, their problems and needs.

Lastly, when students were rated by their teachers on the Supervising Teachers Rating Scale, it appeared that there was a tendency for students to be rated as somewhat less competent in the aspects of their work which were considered as indices of "professionalism". Overall students got the best rating for "accepting criticism and help from others" (a "professional" rating), and the worst for "asking questions which provoke thoughtful responses" (a "classroom" rating). Behaviorally, some sixty percent of the students rated were thought to have promise in early childhood education and should be encouraged to go on in the field, and some sixty-seven percent of the rated students were judged as good enough to hire as teacher aides if they had been eligible.

Feedback from Directors of Day Care Centers

What was evident from reading the day care director's questionnaires was that these directors developed a basic appreciation of the contributions of the teenagers, and, that furthermore, major objectives of the Commission in these projects, to demonstrate that teens can be integrated into day care staffs, was clearly accomplished. There were problems with certain operational aspects of the projects. Pre-entry orientation for the staff varied site by site, yet this was obviously important. Should a planned orientation package be prepared by the Commission? The DCYH project directors generally conducted

the orientations, but sometimes day care directors did so, or it was a joint effort. No pattern emerged.

Should day care staff be involved in the training of students? This was a matter of debate; opinions varied at the centers. The Commission considers it important that students are given training by day care staff.

The large majority of teens were behaving responsibly according to the day care directors, and considering the number of "high risk" individuals for a new program, this finding was significant.

Commentary on Institutionally Related Issues

Participating Schools

Interviews with selected principals and/or chief school administrators confirmed their commitments to maintain programs after the NCRY funding period elapsed. Several major changes in programming schedules for large numbers of students were made to accommodate the program (a major hassle for administrators), better physical facilities were provided after initial difficulties indicated their requirement, and transportation was provided. Child development was added to regular course offerings where it did not exist before.

A variety of spinoffs were noted in some of the high schools, e.g. similar classes were started that involved teenagers in tutoring other youngsters, or working in the community delivering services to other agencies. The DCYH program directors gained the skills predicted in school/community relationships.

Day Care Centers

There was almost universal enthusiasm for the contributions of students to the local centers. Where criticism arose, it was often because students themselves were in conflict with their supervising teachers at the centers over methods of discipline, program content, or their desire to engage in the educational process at a more significant level than was permitted. Sometimes conflicts arose because the supervising teachers were not trained either in early childhood education or in the use of aides, and they were threatened by the competencies of the adolescents and their successes with children. A few students did not want to be in the program and were there because they were forced by counselors or administrators.

Almost every early childhood teacher participating in these programs asked for the youngsters again the following year, planned for their involvement and were able to identify specific contributions they had made.

General Issues

This first year evaluation demonstrated the feasibility and benefits to teenagers of cross-age helping relationships for students working with young children in day care centers. The impact of adolescents on young children in day care settings was not studied because the variables were so complex.

Neighborhood Youth Corps students, coming from the lowest income backgrounds, fitted easily into these projects and were not discriminated against in any ways that could be identified.

Training for day care personnel in the use of aides and specifically teenagers was scattered and not systematic. The Commission subsequently tried to meet this problem through preparation of films, workshop formats and publications.

Training for DCYH program directors was seen as a major problem, and rapport with adolescents was found to be the most important criteria for employment in this work. "A sensitive and insightful person, who is aware of the great personal upheavals precipitated by a review of one's developmental history" was vital to the success of the program. NCRY provided enrichment material for the project directors, but often they were left to their own devices.

Overall, this first evaluation showed that young people had impressed school staffs with their abilities both for entry into the world of work and into the world of young children. The programs at the end of the 1972-73 year looked very promising.

II. 1973-74 Evaluation Report

This report was considered a supplement to the 1972-73 report and was intended to:

1) Compare and contrast findings from this year's study with those of last year;

2) Comment on observations made watching an innovative educational idea as it had been institutionalized;

3) Focus on dissemination activities of the Commission staff as they were outlined in the initial proposal.

The evaluators considered that NCRY had pursued its objectives to demonstrate the DCYH program in diverse geographical locations and with diverse populations; the programs served both rural, suburban and urban youngsters of low and middle income backgrounds, with personal histories of both previous school success as well as profound failure. The evaluators concluded that the initial concepts had been validated and were worthy of continuing support.

Student Population

Salient characteristics were as follows:

1) Hartsdale was the largest project, with 33% of the participants, Laurens the smallest project with 19% (N.B. San Antonio, Hartford and Window Rock were not part of the evaluation study).

2) 59% of the population was female.

3) The 1973-74 population was young, the average age was 14 1/2

4) Nearly 50% of the population was Black, up from 31% the previous year. Only 19% were Spanish-speaking, down from 48% the previous year because San Antonio, with the largest Spanish-speaking population was not included in the evaluation.

5) The population appeared evenly divided between working and middle class students.

Student Participation and Performance

Over two-thirds of the student population evaluated by their teachers was thought to have the potential to continue in early childhood education and should be encouraged to do so. A solid majority of 57% were rated by teachers as employable at the present time; there was a uniformly high valuation of students' professional conduct by their teachers in all projects. Teaching techniques as proficient.

Reactions of Students to Experience in the Program

In the previous year's report, students' relative lack of enthusiasm for the child development class or seminar was noted. Work on the curriculum appeared to have alieviated this problem in 1973-74. There was a slight diminishing student enthusiasm for the work in the centers themselves, but students did not volunteer information on any problems and there may be no single explanation for this slight change.

Future Orientations of Students

This year about half of the population was undecided about jobs and careers. The previous year's population was considerably more settled on career plans and in some measure this must be attributed to the fact that 1973/74's population was much younger.

In terms of child-related jobs, just under half the population which had decided on careers preferred child-related work. In the entire population about one-third of the students had either decided on child-related jobs or found the prospect of such employment acceptable.

Changes in Self Perception

About one-half of the students saw their participation in the program as leading to the discovery of new things about themselves and their relationships with children and adults. One-third of the participating students reported that their tenure in the program had changed them in some way, and the most frequently cited a change in attitudes towards children. (On the other hand, a significant 36% of the students felt the program had not changed them, a considerable increase over last year.)

Results of the Teaching Scale pre and post-tests, however, showed that the year spent by most students in the program had dramatically increased the confidence of the students in performing classroom tasks. The experience of the program also helped students become more competent in preparing and teaching lessons.

"Special" Students *

About one-third of the students were classified as "special" this year; they were equally divided between black and white students. Although children of working class parents did not make up a large part of the population as a whole, they contributed heavily to the ranks of "special" students. Special students became more aware of their relationships with children during the program, regular students became more aware of themselves. Encouragingly, a slightly higher percentage of special students than regular students wished to enroll for the following Fall.

Dissemination activities

Program directors played a role in disseminating information on the DCYH projects by receiving visitors, conducting seminars or workshops, sending information to local media, providing guidance for another teacher who wished to "conduct" a child care class, encouraging students to make presentations at conferences, working with NCRY filmmakers on a film about DCYH.

As reported elsewhere, NCRY prepared two slide-tape presentations, two films, and conducted workshops for education and youth service personnel as well as program directors. They responded to letter and phone enquiries. They laid the groundwork for expanding their program of technical assistance during the final year of operation to over 20 additional sites.

Based on two years of observations, the evaluators concluded that the idear of DCYHP, as initially proposed by NCRY, did demonstrate its feasibility. Students were integrated into day care facilities. Child development classes which grew organically from the day-to-work experiences were conducted with varying levels of effectiveness. Their effectiveness proved to be a function of the kind and ability of students enrolled, the skill and insight of program directors, the quality of the field experience.

The evaluation listed also some of the requisities for good program development, which had become apparent.

III. 1974-75 Evaluation Report

During the final year of evaluation, the instruments were administered by the site staffs at the request of NCRY. Walter Furman then organized and commented on the data collected.

The findings should be primarily considered as descriptive of the program activities during that year rather than used in comparison with previous years.

In general the data does again demonstrate a strong approval on the part of all participants for the main elements of the Day Care Student program.

*Students classified as having behavioral problems prior to entering Program

Student Population

Salient characteristics were:

1) Over 90% of the students were females this year.

2) The average age of the students was back to 15 1/2.

3) Few of the students came from middle-class homes (i.e. profession, executive, managerial type); most were from families with either skilled or semi-skilled working parents.

Vocationally Related Outcomes for Youth Helpers

The data in this section covered work habits of students, future interests and competence of students in early childhood education. Thus the program was influencial in enabling students to reach some kind of decision regarding future employment, whether or not they opted for early childhood programs, and this seemed to be all the more true the older the student.

The data did reveal some success in influencing the capabilities of students to understand and work with young children and teachers rated very highly the relationship between students and the young children, who responded warmly to the students. Teachers did say that they would employ about 60% of the students in the centers.

Other Child Development Related Outcomes

The greatest change at all sites was in child rearing confidence. Students also reported changes in their attitudes and behaviors with respect to young children and, perhaps most importantly, these teenagers did in fact have predominantly good feelings about young children at the end of their experience in the DCYH program.

Institution Related Outcomes

Reports on different aspects of the program, the child development class and the day care center experience, show that more students felt that improvements were needed in the school program or seminar than in the day care center program (47% as opposed to 34%), although no one single problem emerged as dominant. With virtual unanimity, students would recommend the DCYH program to their friends.

Reactions of Day Care Center Teachers

This data covered day care teachers' reactions to the impact of the program on the center as a whole. Although the teachers normally gave good ratings to the assigned students, they believed that they only had a limited impact on the operation of the centers. No teacher concluded that the young children were doing less well, however, and it was hypothesized that the teachers were cautious about assessing the contribution of non-